

may be accorded to needy and suffering veterans and widows; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

6349. By Mr. WEAVER: Petition of citizens of Asheville, N. C., asking for the passage of Sproul bill (H. R. 11410) amending the Volstead law; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

6350. Also, petition of citizens of Cherokee County, N. C., asking for increase of pension for Civil War veterans and their widows; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

6351. By Mr. WELCH of California: Petition from the United States Employees' Association, San Francisco, Calif., containing 49 signatures of citizens of San Francisco, favoring the passage of House bill 6518, to reclassify and increase the salaries of Federal employees; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

6352. By Mr. WINGO: Petition of citizens of Huntington, Ark., advocating increased pensions for veterans of the Civil War and their widows; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

SENATE

TUESDAY, April 3, 1928

(Legislative day of Monday, April 2, 1928)

The Senate reassembled at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senate will receive a message from the House of Representatives.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Chaffee, one of its clerks, communicated to the Senate the resolutions of the House adopted as a tribute to the memory of Hon. FRANK B. WILLIS, late a Senator from the State of Ohio.

The message also announced that the House had passed, without amendment, the following bills of the Senate:

S. 2537. An act to amend section 110, national defense act, so as to provide better administrative procedure in the disbursements for pay of National Guard officers and enlisted men;

S. 2827. An act granting the consent of Congress to the States of South Dakota and Nebraska to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge across the Missouri River at or near Niobrara, Nebr.;

S. 2950. An act to amend the second paragraph of section 67, national defense act, as amended;

S. 3131. An act to provide additional pay for personnel of the United States Navy assigned to duty on submarines and to diving duty; and

S. 3558. An act authorizing Point Pleasant and Henderson Bridge Co., its successors and assigns, to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge across the Kanawha River at or near Point Pleasant, W. Va.

The message further announced that the House had agreed to the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 11140) to provide for the inspection of the battle field of Kings Mountain, S. C.

The message also announced that the House had passed the following bills of the Senate severally with an amendment, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

S. 1822. An act to authorize the Secretary of War to transfer or loan aeronautical equipment to museums and educational institutions;

S. 3118. An act to authorize the construction of a temporary railroad bridge across Pearl River at a point in or near section 35, township 10 north, range 6 east, Leake County, Miss.; and

S. 3119. An act to authorize the construction of a temporary railroad bridge across Pearl River in Rankin County, Miss., and between Madison and Rankin Counties, Miss.

The message further announced that the House had passed the bill (S. 2301) to create a commission to be known as the commission for the enlarging of the Capitol Grounds, and for other purposes, with amendments, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

The message also announced that the House had passed the following bills and joint resolution, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H. R. 15. An act authorizing an appropriation to enable the Secretary of the Interior to carry out the provisions of the act of May 26, 1926 (44 Stat. L. 655), to make additions to the Absaroka and Gallatin National Forests, and to improve and extend the winter-feed facilities of the elk, antelope, and other game animals of Yellowstone National Park and adjacent land;

H. R. 239. An act to amend section 110 of the national defense act by repealing and striking therefrom certain provisions prescribing additional qualifications for National Guard State staff officers, and for other purposes;

H. R. 441. An act to authorize an appropriation to pay half the cost of a bridge and road on the Hoopa Valley Reservation, Calif.;

H. R. 475. An act to permit taxation of lands of homestead and desert-land entrymen under the reclamation act;

H. R. 5495. An act to provide for cooperation by the Smithsonian Institution with State, educational, and scientific organizations in the United States for continuing ethnological researches on the American Indians;

H. R. 5590. An act to authorize appropriations for construction of culverts and trestles in connection with the camp railroad at Camp McClellan, Ala.;

H. R. 6669. An act fixing the salary of the Public Printer and the Deputy Public Printer;

H. R. 6862. An act authorizing and directing the Secretary of the Interior to investigate, hear, and determine the claims of individual members of the Sioux Tribe of Indians against tribal funds or against the United States;

H. R. 7223. An act to add certain lands to the Gunnison National Forest, Colo.;

H. R. 7463. An act amending an act entitled "An act authorizing the Chippewa Indians of Minnesota to submit claims to the Court of Claims";

H. R. 7475. An act to provide for the removal of the Confederate monument and tablets from Greenlawn Cemetery to Garfield Park;

H. R. 8132. An act authorizing the appropriation of \$2,500 for the erection of a tablet or marker at Medicine Lodge, Kans., to commemorate the holding of the Indian peace council, at which treaties were made with the Plains Indians in October, 1867;

H. R. 8295. An act for the appointment of an additional circuit judge for the ninth judicial circuit;

H. R. 8546. An act authorizing an appropriation of \$2,500 for the erection of a tablet or marker at Lititz, Pa., to commemorate the burial place of 110 American soldiers who were wounded in the Battle of Brandywine and died in the military hospital at Lititz;

H. R. 8559. An act to amend section 58 of the act of March 2, 1917, entitled "An act to provide a civil government for Porto Rico, and for other purposes";

H. R. 8742. An act to authorize the Secretary of War to convey to the city of Baton Rouge, La., a portion of the Baton Rouge National Cemetery for use as a public street;

H. R. 8835. An act to amend section 98 of the Judicial Code, as amended, to provide for terms of court at Bryson City, N. C.;

H. R. 9047. An act to authorize appropriations for the construction of roads at the Presidio of San Francisco, Calif.;

H. R. 9363. An act to provide for the completion and repair of customs buildings in Porto Rico;

H. R. 9483. An act to provide for the acquisition of rights of way through the lands of the Pueblo Indians of New Mexico;

H. R. 9485. An act authorizing Roy Clippinger, Ulys Pyle, Edgar Leathers, Groves K. Flescher, Carmen Flescher, their heirs, legal representatives, and assigns, to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge across the Wabash River at or near McGregors Ferry in White County, Ill.;

H. R. 9570. An act to provide for the transfer of the returns office from the Interior Department to the General Accounting Office, and for other purposes;

H. R. 10288. An act to provide for a uniform retirement date for authorized retirements of Federal personnel;

H. R. 10643. An act authorizing the Gulf Coast Properties (Inc.), its successors and assigns, to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge across Lake Champlain at or near Rouses Point, N. Y.;

H. R. 10885. An act to amend sections 23 and 24 of the general leasing act approved February 25, 1920 (41 Stat. L. 437);

H. R. 10952. An act to fix the salaries of certain judges of Porto Rico;

H. R. 11203. An act granting the consent of Congress to the counties of Telfair and Coffee to construct, maintain, and operate a free highway bridge across the Ocmulgee River at or near the present Jacksonville ferry in Telfair and Coffee Counties, Ga.;

H. R. 11212. An act authorizing Paul Leupp, his heirs, legal representatives, or assigns, to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge across the Missouri River at or near Stanton, N. Dak.;

H. R. 11265. An act authorizing the Cabin Creek Kanawha Bridge Co., its successors and assigns, to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge across the Kanawha River at or near Cabin Creek, W. Va.;

H. R. 11266. An act authorizing the St. Albans Nitro Bridge Co., its successors and assigns, to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge across the Kanawha River at or near St. Albans, Kanawha County, W. Va.;

H. R. 11267. An act granting the consent of Congress to the board of county commissioners of Itasca County, Minn., to construct, maintain, and operate a free highway bridge across the Mississippi River at or near the road between the villages of Cohasset and Deer River, Minn.;

H. R. 11356. An act authorizing the State of Indiana to construct, maintain, and operate a toll bridge across the Ohio River at or near Rockport, Ind.;

H. R. 11473. An act granting the consent of Congress to the States of North Dakota and Minnesota to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge across the Red River of the North at Fargo, N. Dak.;

H. R. 11478. An act to amend an act to allot lands to children on the Crow Reservation, Mont.;

H. R. 11479. An act to reserve certain lands on the public domain in Valencia County, N. Mex., for the use and benefit of the Acoma Pueblo Indians;

H. R. 11578. An act authorizing the B & P Bridge Co., its successors and assigns, to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge across the Rio Grande River at or near Weslaco, Tex.;

H. R. 11583. An act granting the consent of Congress to the State Highway Commission of Arkansas to construct, maintain, and operate a toll bridge across the White River at Cotter, Ark.;

H. R. 11625. An act granting the consent of Congress to the State of Montana, Valley County, Mont., and Garfield County, Mont., or to any or either of them, jointly or severally, to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge across the Missouri River at or near Glasgow, Mont.;

H. R. 11629. An act to amend the proviso of the act approved August 24, 1912, with reference to educational leave to employees of the Indian Service;

H. R. 11685. An act to accept the cession by the State of California of exclusive jurisdiction over the lands embraced within the Lassen Volcanic National Park, and for other purposes;

H. R. 12030. An act to amend Title II of an act approved February 28, 1925 (43 Stat. 1066, U. S. C., title 39), regulating postal rates, and for other purposes;

H. R. 12245. An act to amend the War Finance Corporation act, approved April 5, 1918, as amended;

H. R. 12320. An act to amend the longshoremen's and harbor workers' compensation act;

H. R. 12441. An act to amend section 2 of an act entitled "An act in reference to writs of error," approved January 31, 1928, Public, No. 10, Seventieth Congress; and

H. J. Res. 26. Joint resolution authorizing the Secretary of Agriculture to dispose of real property, located in Hernando County, Fla., known as the Brooksville Plant Introduction Garden, no longer required for plant-introduction purposes.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The message further announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills, and they were signed by the Vice President:

S. 43. An act for the relief of Frederick N. Carr;
S. 46. An act for the relief of Daniel F. Roberts;
S. 138. An act for the relief of Thomas Johnsen;
S. 1899. An act for the relief of Clifford D. Ham, collector general of customs, administrator of Corinto Wharf, Republic of Nicaragua;

S. 2020. An act for the relief of Leonidas L. Cochran and Rosalie Cochran Brink;

S. 2657. An act for the relief of George W. Boyer; and

H. R. 9020. An act to amend an act entitled "An act to establish a Code of Law for the District of Columbia," approved March 3, 1901, and the acts amendatory thereof and supplementary thereto.

CALL OF THE ROLL

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Ashurst	Couzens	Harris	Phipps
Barkley	Curtis	Harrison	Pine
Bayard	Dale	Hayden	Pittman
Bingham	Edge	Heflin	Ransdell
Black	Edwards	Kendrick	Reed, Pa.
Blaine	Fletcher	Keyes	Robinson, Ark.
Bleasde	Frazier	King	Sackett
Borah	George	McLean	Sheppard
Bratton	Gerry	McMaster	Shipstead
Brookhart	Gillett	McNary	Shortridge
Broussard	Glass	Mayfield	Simmons
Bruce	Goff	Neely	Smith
Capper	Gooding	Nye	Smoot
Caraway	Gould	Oddie	Stock
Copeland	Greene	Overman	Steiwer

Stephens
Swanson
Tydings

Tyson
Wagner
Walsh, Mass.

Walsh, Mont.
Warren
Waterman

Wheeler

Mr. CURTIS. I desire to announce that the Senator from Washington [Mr. JONES], the Senator from Ohio [Mr. FESS], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. WATSON], the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. MOSES], and the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. METCALF] are detained from the Senate attending the funeral of the late Senator Willis. I will let this announcement stand for the day.

I also wish to announce that the Senator from Maine [Mr. HALE] is detained in committee.

Mr. GERRY. I desire to announce that the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. MCKELLAR], the Senator from Washington [Mr. DILL], and the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. THOMAS] are detained from the Senate in attendance upon the funeral of the late Senator WILLIS. I ask that this announcement may stand for the day.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Seventy Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

TRANSFER OR LOAN OF AERONAUTICAL EQUIPMENT

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the amendment of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 1822) to authorize the Secretary of War to transfer or loan aeronautical equipment to museums and educational institutions, which was, on page 1, line 12, to strike out "delivery" and insert "transfer or loan."

Mr. REED of Pennsylvania. I move that the Senate disagree to the amendment of the House, request a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to, and the Vice President appointed Mr. REED of Pennsylvania, Mr. BINGHAM, and Mr. FLETCHER conferees on the part of the Senate.

REVISION OF CONVENTION FOR SAFETY OF LIFE AT SEA (S. DOC. NO. 80)

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, which was read, and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations and ordered to be printed:

To the Congress of the United States:

I commend to the favorable consideration of the Congress the inclosed report from the Secretary of State, to the end that legislation may be enacted to authorize an appropriation of \$100,000 for the expenses of participation by the United States in the International Conference for the Revision of the Convention of 1914 for the Safety of Life at Sea, to be held in London, England, in 1929.

CALVIN COOLIDGE.

THE WHITE HOUSE, April 3, 1928.

CONFERENCE OF CONCILIATION AND ARBITRATION (S. DOC. NO. 79)

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, which was read, and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations and ordered to be printed:

To the Congress of the United States:

I commend to the favorable consideration of the Congress the inclosed report from the Secretary of State, to the end that legislation may be enacted requesting (1) the President to extend to the Republics of America an invitation to attend a conference of conciliation and arbitration to be held at Washington during 1928, for the purpose of drawing up a convention for the realization of the principle of arbitration for the pacific solution of their international differences of a juridical nature which was adopted in the resolution passed at the Sixth International Conference of American States; (2) the authorization of an appropriation of \$60,000 for the expenses of such a conference.

CALVIN COOLIDGE.

THE WHITE HOUSE, April 3, 1928.

WAR FINANCE CORPORATION

Mr. GLASS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to call up, out of the regular order, the bill (S. 3685) to amend the War Finance Corporation act, approved April 5, 1918, as amended.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Virginia?

Mr. BLEASE. Mr. President, I would like to know the purpose of the bill.

Mr. GLASS. It is identical with a bill unanimously passed by the House of Representatives on yesterday to extend the

life of the War Finance Corporation merely to enable the corporation to take care of \$1,500,000 of outstanding loans. The corporation is not engaging in any new business at all, but it has outstanding \$1,500,000 of these loans which it is necessary to take care of. A similar bill unanimously passed the House on yesterday.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. Mr. President, can the Senator advise us as to just how the business of the corporation stands as a matter of debits and credits?

Mr. GLASS. No; I can not advise the Senator as to that. The corporation has a very large balance to its credit in profits, if that is what the Senator means. It has now outstanding \$1,500,000 of loans that have to be liquidated, and this is the purpose of the bill.

Mr. EDGE. Mr. President, that answers the question I was about to ask. They are liquidating, as rapidly as it can be done, the interests of the Government?

Mr. GLASS. Yes. The life of the corporation expires within three days; hence the House yesterday, under unanimous consent, passed the bill.

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. Mr. President, I hope the request of the Senator from Virginia will be acceded to. I think the proposed legislation is necessary.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Virginia? The Chair hears none.

Mr. GLASS. I ask that the House bill may be substituted for the Senate bill.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, may I ask the Senator if the bills are identical?

Mr. GLASS. They are identical.

The VICE PRESIDENT. There being no objection, the Chair lays the House bill before the Senate.

The bill (H. R. 12245) to amend the War Finance Corporation Act, approved April 5, 1918, as amended, was read twice by its title, and the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to its consideration.

Mr. FLETCHER. Mr. President, I think perhaps there ought to be an extension of time, although the War Finance Corporation have not been authorized to make any loans since December 31, 1924. They have been all this time liquidating. It would seem that enough time has elapsed for them to have wound up their business, but they appear to have on hand these obligations which they have not yet been able to collect, and, of course, it stands to reason that those acquainted with the business are best qualified to know how to handle it. I hope the expenses will be reduced to a minimum in order that there may not be a lot of people continued in positions unnecessarily.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, Senate bill 3685 will be indefinitely postponed.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Mr. WARREN presented a resolution adopted by the Lions Club, of Riverton, Wyo., favoring the enactment of legislation to provide for aided and directed settlement on Federal reclamation projects, which was referred to the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation.

He also presented a resolution adopted by Local Union No. 2282, United Mine Workers of America, of Rock Springs, Wyo., favoring the maintenance in the eastern bituminous fields of the so-called Jacksonville scale of wages for coal miners, which was referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

Mr. COPELAND presented petitions of sundry citizens of New York City and Brooklyn, N. Y., praying for the passage of legislation granting increased pensions to Civil War veterans and their widows, which were referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. ASHURST presented a resolution of Cactus Chapter, No. 2, Disabled American Veterans of the World War, United States Veterans' Hospital No. 51, Tucson, Ariz., which was referred to the Committee on Finance and ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Whereas the Circuit Court of Appeals of the Ninth Circuit on March 5, 1928, handed down a decision wherein it was held that the four-year statute of limitations of the State of Arizona applied to all insurance suits against the Government brought by ex-service men residing in this State; and

Whereas there are several hundred ex-service men residing in Arizona who were totally and permanently disabled at the time of discharge, and who will be unable to collect upon their insurance, which was in force at the time they became totally and permanently disabled, unless Congress shall pass a law extending the time within which suit may be brought against the Government; and

Whereas in a great many cases it was impossible to determine that the disability of the ex-service man was total and permanent until after the expiration of the time within which suit could be brought under the Arizona statute; and

Whereas a great many of the disabled ex-service men in Arizona are patients in Government hospitals and were sent here on account of their health and are thus deprived of the benefits of the statutes of limitations of their home State; and

Whereas we believe that the application of the law should be made uniform, irrespective of the State within which the ex-service man resides; and

Whereas a bill has been introduced in Congress by Congressman ROYAL C. JOHNSON, of South Dakota (H. R. 11350), granting the right to ex-service men to sue upon their insurance policies at any time within 20 years from the accrual of the cause of action; and

Whereas it is imperative that such bill should immediately be passed in order to protect the rights of those ex-service men now having cases pending before the courts; Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That we heartily indorse said bill and that we respectfully request the Arizona delegation in Congress to support the same and that a copy of this resolution be mailed to Congressman ROYAL C. JOHNSON and Senators HENRY F. ASHURST, CARL HAYDEN, and Congressman LEWIS DOUGLAS, and that copies be furnished to such other individuals and organizations as from time to time it may be deemed advisable.

The foregoing resolution was duly authorized and approved by Cactus Chapter, No. 2, Disabled American Veterans of the World War, United States Veterans' Hospital No. 51, Tucson, Ariz.

CLYDE D. BEISTEL, *Commander*.
CHARLES L. EDGERTON, *Adjutant*.
JAMES C. HERRON,
JOSEPH THOMAS,
LA RUE E. GOODRICH,
FRED DACEY,
FRANCIS J. NILLES,
Executive Committee.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

Mr. GLASS, from the Committee on the District of Columbia, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 8298) authorizing acquisition of a site for the farmers' produce market, and for other purposes, reported it without amendment and submitted a report (No. 682) thereon.

Mr. BLACK, from the Committee on Claims, to which was referred the bill (S. 445) for the relief of the Florida East Coast Car Ferry Co., reported it without amendment and submitted a report (No. 683) thereon.

Mr. BAYARD, from the Committee on Claims, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 9583) authorizing the reporting to the Congress of certain claims and demands asserted against the United States, reported it without amendment and submitted a report (No. 684) thereon.

Mr. NYE, from the Committee on Public Lands and Surveys, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 11020) validating certain applications for and entries of public lands, reported it with amendments and submitted a report (No. 685) thereon.

He also, from the same committee, to which were referred the following bills, reported them severally without amendment and submitted reports thereon:

S. 3361. An act authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to convey to the city of Hot Springs, Ark., all of lot No. 3 in block No. 115 in the city of Hot Springs, Ark. (Rept. No. 686);

S. 3677. An act to withhold timberlands from sale under the timber and stone act (Rept. No. 687);

H. R. 1997. An act for the relief of Clifford J. Turner (Rept. No. 688); and

H. R. 9144. An act to provide for the conveyance of certain lands in the State of Wisconsin for State park purposes (Rept. No. 689).

Mr. ODDIE, from the Committee on Public Lands and Surveys, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 5687) authorizing and directing the Secretary of the Interior to sell certain public lands to the Cabazon Water Co., issue patent therefor, and for other purposes, reported it without amendment and submitted a report (No. 690) thereon.

Mr. McNARY, from the Committee on Public Lands and Surveys, to which were referred the following bills, reported them each with amendments and submitted reports thereon:

S. 3224. An act authorizing the adjustment of the boundaries of the Crater National Forest, in the State of Oregon, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 691); and

S. 3225. An act to enlarge the boundaries of the Crater National Forest (Rept. No. 692).

ENROLLED BILLS PRESENTED

Mr. GREENE, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that this day that committee presented to the President of the United States the following enrolled bills:

- S. 43. An act for the relief of Frederick N. Carr;
- S. 46. An act for the relief of Daniel F. Roberts;
- S. 138. An act for the relief of Thomas Johnsen;
- S. 1899. An act for the relief of Clifford D. Ham, collector general of customs, administrator of Corinto Wharf, Republic of Nicaragua;
- S. 2020. An act for the relief of Leonidas L. Cochran and Rosalie Cochran Brink; and
- S. 2657. An act for the relief of George W. Boyer.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION INTRODUCED

Bills and a joint resolution were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. TYDINGS:

A bill (S. 3878) authorizing the President of the United States to present in the name of Congress a Congressional Medal of Honor to Capt. Edward V. Rickenbacker; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. McMASTER:

A bill (S. 3879) to create a commission to investigate the issuance of fee simple patents to Indians not applying therefor, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. CAPPER:

A bill (S. 3880) to revise, amend, and reenact the provisions of the Code of Law for the District of Columbia relating to the acquisition of land in the said District for the use of the United States; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. HARRIS:

A bill (S. 3881) to provide for the paving of the Government road, known as the Dry Valley Road, commencing where said road leaves the La Fayette Road, in the city of Rossville, Ga., and extending to Chickamauga and Chattanooga National Military Park, constituting an approach road to said park; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. WHEELER:

A bill (S. 3882) to limit construction charges against irrigable lands in the Blackfeet irrigation project, State of Montana, to \$40 an acre; and

A bill (S. 3883) to limit construction charges against irrigable lands in the Milk River irrigation project, State of Montana, to \$40 an acre; to the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation.

By Mr. REED of Pennsylvania:

A bill (S. 3884) authorizing the sale of surplus War Department real property at Jeffersonville, Ind.;

A bill (S. 3885) to define the terms "child" and "children" as used in the acts of May 18, 1920, and June 10, 1922; and

A bill (S. 3886) to require certain contracts entered into by the Secretary of War, or by officers authorized by him to make them, to be in writing, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. RANDELL:

A joint resolution (S. J. Res. 120) authorizing the Secretary of War to lease to the New Orleans Association of Commerce New Orleans Quartermaster Intermediate Depot Unit No. 2; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

AMENDMENTS TO TAX REDUCTION BILL—EVIDENCES OF INDEBTEDNESS IN REAL-ESTATE SALES

Mr. FLETCHER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to House bill 1, the tax reduction bill, which was referred to the Committee on Finance and ordered to be printed.

ALLOWABLE DEPRECIATION OR DEPLETION

Mr. RANDELL submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to House bill 1, the tax reduction bill, which was referred to the Committee on Finance and ordered to be printed.

AMENDMENT TO DEFICIENCY APPROPRIATION BILL

Mr. ODDIE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the second deficiency appropriation bill, which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed, as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR, BUREAU OF RECLAMATION

Water-storage reservoir sites, Truckee River: The unexpended balance of the appropriation of \$50,000 for the survey and examination of water-storage reservoir sites on the headwaters of the Truckee River, and for other purposes, contained in the act making appropriations for the Department of the Interior for the fiscal year 1928 (44

Stat. L. 934), shall remain available during the fiscal year 1920 for the same purposes, and is hereby made immediately available for the survey and examination of water-storage reservoir sites on the Carson River, investigations of dam sites at such storage reservoirs, examination and survey of lands susceptible of irrigation from waters that may be practically so impounded, and estimates of costs, with recommendations in regard thereto: *Provided*, That the above-mentioned work shall be performed in cooperation with the State engineer of Nevada, under such arrangement as may be made between the Secretary of the Interior and said State engineer.

HOUSE BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION REFERRED

The following bills and joint resolution were severally read twice by their titles and referred as indicated below:

H. R. 6669. An act fixing the salary of the Public Printer and the Deputy Public Printer; to the Committee on Printing.

H. R. 12030. An act to amend Title II of an act approved February 28, 1925 (43 Stat. 1066, U. S. C., title 39), regulating postal rates, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

H. R. 8559. An act to amend section 58 of the act of March 2, 1917, entitled "An act to provide a civil government for Porto Rico, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Territories and Insular Possessions.

H. R. 9363. An act to provide for the completion and repair of customs buildings in Porto Rico; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

H. R. 10288. An act to provide for a uniform retirement date for authorized retirements of Federal personnel; to the Committee on Civil Service.

H. R. 5495. An act to provide for cooperation by the Smithsonian Institution with State, educational, and scientific organizations in the United States for continuing ethnological researches on the American Indians;

H. R. 7463. An act amending an act entitled "An act authorizing the Chippewa Indians of Minnesota to submit claims to the Court of Claims"; and

H. R. 10885. An act to amend sections 23 and 24 of the general leasing act approved February 25, 1920 (41 Stat. L. 437); to the calendar.

H. R. 7475. An act to provide for the removal of the Confederate monument and tablets from Greenlawn Cemetery to Garfield Park;

H. R. 8132. An act authorizing the appropriation of \$2,500 for the erection of a tablet or marker at Medicine Lodge, Kans., to commemorate the holding of the Indian peace council, at which treaties were made with the Plains Indians in October, 1867; and

H. R. 8546. An act authorizing an appropriation of \$2,500 for the erection of a tablet or marker at Lititz, Pa., to commemorate the burial place of 110 American soldiers who were wounded in the Battle of Brandywine and died in the military hospital at Lititz; to the Committee on the Library.

H. R. 8295. An act for the appointment of an additional circuit judge for the ninth judicial circuit;

H. R. 8835. An act to amend section 98 of the Judicial Code, as amended, to provide for terms of court at Bryson City, N. C.;

H. R. 10952. An act to fix the salaries of certain judges of Porto Rico;

H. R. 12320. An act to amend the longshoremen's and harbor workers' compensation act; and

H. R. 12441. An act to amend section 2 of an act entitled "An act in reference to writs of error," approved January 31, 1928, Public, No. 10, Seventieth Congress; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 239. An act to amend section 110 of the national defense act by repealing and striking therefrom certain provisions prescribing additional qualifications for National Guard State staff officers, and for other purposes;

H. R. 5590. An act to authorize appropriations for construction of culverts and trestles in connection with the camp railroad at Camp McClellan, Ala.;

H. R. 8742. An act to authorize the Secretary of War to convey to the city of Baton Rouge, La., a portion of the Baton Rouge National Cemetery for use as a public street; and

H. R. 9047. An act to authorize appropriations for the construction of roads at the Presidio of San Francisco, Calif.; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

H. R. 15. An act authorizing an appropriation to enable the Secretary of the Interior to carry out the provisions of the act of May 26, 1926 (44 Stat. L. 655), to make additions to the Absaroka and Gallatin National Forests, and to improve and extend the winter-feed facilities of the elk, antelope, and other

game animals of Yellowstone National Park and adjacent land;

H. R. 475. An act to permit taxation of lands of homestead and desert-land entrymen under the reclamation act;

H. R. 7223. An act to add certain lands to the Gunnison National Forest, Colo.;

H. R. 9570. An act to provide for the transfer of the returns office from the Interior Department to the General Accounting Office, and for other purposes; and

H. R. 11685. An act to accept the cession by the State of California of exclusive jurisdiction over the lands embraced within the Lassen Volcanic National Park, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Lands and Surveys.

H. R. 441. An act to authorize an appropriation to pay half the cost of a bridge and road on the Hoopa Valley Reservation, Calif.;

H. R. 6862. An act authorizing and directing the Secretary of the Interior to investigate, hear, and determine the claims of individual members of the Sioux Tribe of Indians against tribal funds or against the United States;

H. R. 9483. An act to provide for the acquisition of rights of way through the lands of the Pueblo Indians of New Mexico;

H. R. 11478. An act to amend an act to allot lands to children on the Crow Reservation, Mont.;

H. R. 11479. An act to reserve certain lands on the public domain in Valencia County, N. Mex., for the use and benefit of the Acoma Pueblo Indians; and

H. R. 11629. An act to amend the proviso of the act approved August 24, 1912, with reference to educational leave to employees of the Indian Service; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

H. R. 9485. An act authorizing Roy Clippinger, Ulys Pyle, Edgar Leathers, Groves K. Flescher, Carmen Flescher, their heirs, legal representatives, and assigns, to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge across the Wabash River at or near McGregors Ferry in White County, Ill.;

H. R. 10643. An act authorizing the Gulf Coast Properties (Inc.), its successors and assigns, to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge across Lake Champlain at or near Rouses Point, N. Y.;

H. R. 11203. An act granting the consent of Congress to the counties of Telfair and Coffee to construct, maintain, and operate a free highway bridge across the Ocmulgee River at or near the present Jacksonville ferry in Telfair and Coffee Counties, Ga.;

H. R. 11212. An act authorizing Paul Leupp, his heirs, legal representatives, or assigns, to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge across the Missouri River at or near Stanton, N. Dak.;

H. R. 11265. An act authorizing the Cabin Creek Kanawha Bridge Co., its successors and assigns, to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge across the Kanawha River at or near Cabin Creek, W. Va.;

H. R. 11266. An act authorizing the St. Albans Nitro Bridge Co., its successors and assigns, to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge across the Kanawha River at or near St. Albans, Kanawha County, W. Va.;

H. R. 11267. An act granting the consent of Congress to the board of county commissioners of Itasca County, Minn., to construct, maintain, and operate a free highway bridge across the Mississippi River at or near the road between the villages of Cohasset and Deer River, Minn.;

H. R. 11356. An act authorizing the State of Indiana to construct, maintain, and operate a toll bridge across the Ohio River at or near Rockport, Ind.;

H. R. 11473. An act granting the consent of Congress to the States of North Dakota and Minnesota to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge across the Red River of the North at Fargo, N. Dak.;

H. R. 11578. An act authorizing the B & P Bridge Co., its successors and assigns, to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge across the Rio Grande River at or near Weslaco, Tex.;

H. R. 11583. An act granting the consent of Congress to the State Highway Commission of Arkansas to construct, maintain, and operate a toll bridge across the White River at Cotter, Ark.; and

H. R. 11625. An act granting the consent of Congress to the State of Montana, Valley County, Mont., and Garfield County, Mont., or to any or either of them, jointly or severally, to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge across the Missouri River at or near Glasgow, Mont.; to the Committee on Commerce.

H. J. Res. 26. Joint resolution authorizing the Secretary of Agriculture to dispose of real property, located in Hernando County, Fla., known as the Brooksville Plant Introduction Garden, no longer required for plant-introduction purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

SALE OF LANDS IN LOUISIANA AND MISSISSIPPI

Mr. STEPHENS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (H. R. 6993) authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to sell and patent certain lands in Louisiana and Mississippi. The bill authorizes the Secretary of the Interior, in his judgment and discretion, to sell certain lands, which are described in the bill, located in the two States named. A similar bill on the subject passed both Houses at the last session, but failed to reach the President in time for his signature, I believe; at any rate, it did not become a law.

I introduced a somewhat similar bill at this session and the matter was referred to the Department of the Interior. The Secretary drafted a new bill and the bill for which I now ask consideration is the bill prepared in the Department of the Interior and has the indorsement of that department. I ask unanimous consent for its immediate consideration.

Mr. CURTIS. There is no objection to it so far as I know.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Mississippi?

There being no objection, the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the bill, and it was read, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior, in his judgment and discretion, is hereby authorized to sell, in the manner hereinafter provided, any of those lands which he has found or shall hereafter find are public lands of the United States that have accreted to section 14 of township 5 north, range 4 west, Washington meridian, in the State of Mississippi, and to sections 65, 66, 67, and 68, of township 5 north, range 9 east, Louisiana meridian, in the State of Louisiana, and which are not lawfully appropriated by a qualified settler or entryman or other adverse claimant claiming under the public land laws.

Sec. 2. That the owners of said above-described lots or sections shall have a preferred right to file in the office of the register of the United States Land Office of the district in which the lands are situated an application to purchase the public lands thus formed by accretion at any time within 90 days from the filing of plats of such accreted area in the United States Land Office. Every such application must be accompanied with satisfactory proof that the applicant is entitled to such preference right by virtue of the ownership of said above described lots or sections and that the lands which he applies to purchase are not in the legal possession of any adverse claimant.

Sec. 3. That upon the filing of any application to purchase any lands subject to the operation of this act, together with the required proof, the Secretary of the Interior shall cause the lands described in said application to be appraised, including the timber thereon and the stumpage value of any timber cut or removed by the applicant or his predecessors in interest. Such appraisal shall be exclusive of any increased value resulting from the development or improvement of the land for agricultural purposes by the applicant or his predecessors in interest.

Sec. 4. That an applicant who applies to purchase land under the provisions of this act, in order to be entitled to receive a patent must, within 30 days from receipt of notice of appraisal by the Secretary of the Interior, pay to the register of the United States Land Office of the district in which the lands are situated the appraised value of the lands, and thereupon patent shall issue to said applicant for such lands as the Secretary of the Interior shall determine that such applicant is entitled to purchase under this act. The proceeds derived by the Government from the sale of lands hereunder shall be covered into the United States Treasury and applied as provided by law for the disposal of the proceeds from the sale of public lands.

Sec. 5. If, at the date of the approval of this act, any of the lots or sections or parts of lots or sections above described are covered by a pending entry on which satisfactory final proof in support thereof has not been submitted, patent based on any application to purchase land subject to the provisions of this act shall be withheld to await the completion of the pending entry. If, upon completion of the pending entry, it shall then be found that applicant has shown due compliance with the law under the said pending unperfected entry and his application to purchase is otherwise satisfactory patent on said application to purchase shall then be issued.

Sec. 6. That the Secretary of the Interior is hereby authorized to prescribe all necessary rules and regulations for administering the provisions of this act and determining conflicting claims arising hereunder.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

DEMOCRATIC PRESIDENTIAL CAMPAIGN

Mr. BLEASE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record certain newspaper articles which I send to the desk, relating to the Democratic national campaign.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered. The articles are as follows:

[From the Columbia Record, Columbia, S. C., Monday, March 26, 1928]

THREATENS TO BOLT HOUSTON CONVENTION IF SMITH NOMINATED—DOMINANT SOUTH CAROLINA FACTION DETERMINED TO SUPPORT ONLY A DRY, NON-CATHOLIC CANDIDATE—DEMOCRATS EXPECT NATIONAL DEFEAT, BUT STATE WILL SUPPORT PARTY AT ELECTION EVEN THOUGH VOTES HAVE TO BE SHUFFLED—CRY OF "NIGGER" ENOUGH TO ROUSE ANTI-REPUBLICAN PREJUDICES

[EDITOR'S NOTE: This letter, under a Columbia date of March 22, was written to the Boston Transcript by Theodore G. Joslin, Washington correspondent of that newspaper. It should be of interest to voters of South Carolina.]

The dominant faction of the Democratic Party in South Carolina is doing its utmost to select a delegation to the Houston convention that will vote from the first to the last ballot against the nomination of Gov. Al Smith, and that will join, if necessary, with delegations from other Southern States to bolt the convention if the New York executive proves to be the two-thirds choice of the gathering. This faction, comprising voters who are politically dry or who are opposed to Smith because of his race and religion, are depending upon the leadership of Senator COLEMAN L. BLEASE, for years the political firebrand of the Jessamine State, and Gov. John G. Richards, his intimate friend, to "preserve the highest of southern traditions."

Not all the party leaders, however, are antagonistic to the northern candidate, who, if nominated and elected, would be the first Roman Catholic to enter the White House. On the contrary, various of these leaders, who insist that they could defeat Senator BLEASE if they should consolidate their forces, are willing to support Smith or are openly espousing his candidacy. Among them is former Congressman A. F. Lever, author of the war-time food control act, who has announced for Smith and whose declaration has resulted in his being boomed for the governorship two years hence, when the term of Governor Richards will expire. They assert that the time has come "to end all this hypocrisy," predicting that the State convention, which will be held 60 days hence to select the delegates, will be the most exciting in many years.

READY TO BOLT THE CONVENTION

On the basis of present conditions, the Blease-Richards faction can not but control the convention, in which event the delegation, while not necessarily instructed against Smith, will be pledged to vote first, last, and all the time for a dry candidate, thus premising their opposition to the New York governor on his wetness rather than on his religion. The pro-Smith faction does not intend, for the present at least, to ask for a Smith delegation. Rather, it intends to seek an unpledged delegation, believing that, if successful, the delegation can be induced to swing to Smith some time during the balloting. Feeling among Protestants in the State is so strong that the chances momentarily are against the Smith forces winning, even though they have the support of some of the most influential newspapers in the State. The sentiment of the present majority is expressed concisely in the following interview which Governor Richards granted to me:

"We will give our support to a dry, but we will not support any candidate who is a wet. The Smith supporters already have started a band-wagon movement for him, but it has had no effect. If Smith is nominated he will be defeated overwhelmingly. That is a foregone conclusion, in my opinion. The same fate would await any other wet. With Smith as the nominee, the Democratic vote in South Carolina would be the smallest in its history. It is not at all improbable that the South Carolina delegation would join in a rump convention if Smith should prove to be the two-thirds choice of the convention."

PARTY CAN NOT SQUARE ITSELF

"I am hopeful, however, that some outstanding Democrat who is a dry will be nominated, and I believe he will be. I think that Owen D. Young, of New York, former Secretary of War Newton D. Baker, Gov. Vic Donahey, of Ohio, Senator WALTER F. GEORGE, of Georgia, and many others are available. Here's my position. I can not understand how the Democratic Party can square itself by nominating a man who is sworn, if elected, to support the Constitution and who openly violates the eighteenth amendment. I don't believe the Democratic Party will be so foolish as to nominate that type of man."

Governor Richards spoke with all sincerity. He is a dry, politically and personally. Other leaders who are as opposed to Smith as he is, giving prohibition as their reason for opposing him, are as wet as Smith ever was, availing themselves of "the mountain dew" which is made in the hills surrounding the State capital and sold in this city at about any price one wants to pay for it. The truth is that much of the antagonism to Smith is due to religious intolerance, more so, in fact, than in Virginia and North Carolina, which I have surveyed already. Until now the Baptists and Methodists have controlled the Democratic Party. Whether they can be ousted will be determined by the May convention.

RECONCILED ALREADY TO DEFEAT

A most significant fact is that the rank and file of the party is giving comparatively little attention to national politics. All the talking is being done by the leaders of the rival factions, the "ins" and the "outs." The average man on the streets and the "hill billies," as the country folk hereabouts are referred to, are not even thinking about the coming campaign. I tried to talk politics with the farmers—"red necks"—who boarded the local train on the tedious ride from Raleigh to Columbia. They said that "this Smith rumpus" didn't "consarn" them. Clerks in the stores here said they were not interested. Attempts to draw them out produced only the supplementary information that they did not believe the Democratic Party had any chance of winning the election, regardless of whether Smith or anyone else was nominated; in fact, gave the impression that they would be contented if the Republicans won the election this year, even though adherence to the Democratic Party has been born and bred in them.

This brings up an interesting point. The party chieftains seem to be agreed in only one particular, namely, that defeat will be the portion of Democracy again. The anti-Smith leaders asserted that they were convinced the New York governor would be defeated if he should be nominated, saying that while he might capture some Northern States, these gains would be offset by losses in the border land and even in the South, mentioning most often Tennessee, Kentucky, and Oklahoma, and occasionally referring to Alabama and Florida. One of these leaders said he had no doubt that if Smith received the nomination Florida would go to the Republican nominee, asserting he had first-hand information in that particular. His statement was surprising enough to hear in the one section of the country that always has turned thumbs down on the Republican Party, but it wasn't half as startling as to hear another leader, whose business has prospered in recent years, assert: "I never thought I would ever say it, but the truth is I am convinced that the welfare of the country for the next four years depends on the election of a Republican President. I know that the election of a Democratic President would mean business depression for a year at least, and I don't want that to happen."

WANT TO GET RID OF BLEASE

The anti-Smith leaders do not go half as far as do the friends of Smith. The latter declare that Smith is the one and only Democrat who can hope to be elected. They accept all reports from the North at their face value. They admit that Smith might lose a few of the border States because of religious intolerance, but they insist that such losses would be more than offset by gains in the North and East. They really believe that Smith can carry New York, New Jersey, Massachusetts, Ohio, and Illinois and ask anyone to name any other candidate who can begin to command such support as they believe is at the disposal of their favorite. They are trying to interest the apathetic public in the arguments which they are making, believing that if they can arouse sufficient enthusiasm they not only will get support for Smith by the State's delegation, but can rid themselves of Senator BLEASE, whom they cordially hate and whose contribution to the campaign to date has been to say he favored "BILL" BORAH. One motive is almost as important as the other, for they have convinced themselves that BLEASE is unhappy in the Senate and is preparing to exchange places two years hence with Governor Richards, sending the governor to the Senate in his place and assuming the governorship again for himself, thus becoming "a big toad in a small puddle" again.

If there is any other agreement among the contending factions, it is that whatever the Houston convention may do, South Carolina will remain in the Democratic column. They say that under no circumstances will the State go Republican, even though the Democratic majority may be reduced to next to nothing. Even if a rump convention should be held and the State should give its support to the dry nominated by that gathering, the State would regard that nominee as much, if not more, of a Democrat than the choice of the regular convention. There are some Republicans here, of course, but they are in a minority and no matter how strong Democratic feeling may run the staunch party leaders need only shout "nigger" for 10 days before the election to assure at least a fractional Democratic majority, and even if it wasn't polled honestly the ballots would be juggled sufficiently to permit announcement of the desired result. This may not be pleasant reading in a Northern city, particularly as it refers to the negro, but the survey I am making will be futile if I do not report facts as I find them.

HOOVER OR DAWES WOULD SATISFY

Intense as is the feeling regarding the negro when his voting equality is considered if not respected, and notwithstanding that the members of this race personify the Republican Party from the point of view of most Southern gentlemen, it is a fact that such Republicans as President Coolidge, Secretary Hoover, and Vice President Dawes are praised here in the South as they are in the North, not to the same extent, but sincerely. Most white folks in the South want a Democrat for President, but if their wishes can not be gratified they will not be broken hearted if either Hoover or Dawes should be elected and they would be

quite happy under four more years of Coolidge. Presumably the South Carolina delegation to the Republican convention will turn eventually to Dawes after it has supported former Governor Lowden, its moves being determined by Joseph W. Tolbert, the Republican national committeeman, who will dominate it. This is the situation in South Carolina as revealed by the survey I have made, with as merry a fight in prospect during the next two months as the State has seen in "10, these many years."

[From the Anderson Independent, Anderson, S. C., Sunday morning, April 1, 1928]

OPPOSES ANY CHANGE IN RULES IN DEMOCRATIC PARTY

By John K. Aull

COLUMBIA, March 31.—"In the first place, I have never thought of even attempting to exchange positions with Governor Richards," United States Senator COLE L. BLEASE writes the Anderson Independent's Columbia correspondent in reply to certain questions asked by this writer in view of a recent article in the Boston Transcript, reprinted here by the afternoon daily paper, the article being written by the Boston paper's Washington correspondent, who visited Columbia in his tour of the country, writing articles on the national political situation. While here he, however, dipped into State affairs also. "As far as I can see ahead now," writes Senator BLEASE, "I shall be a candidate to succeed myself in the Senate."

The Senator reiterates the position which he has heretofore made plain, and nails the rumor, again given circulation by the Boston Transcript and the Columbia Record, which reprinted the article, that what the Boston paper's correspondent termed the "Blease-Richards" faction was threatening a bolt if Smith should be nominated. "Both Governor Richards and myself have time and time again said," says Senator BLEASE, "that we would support Mr. Smith if he were the nominee of the Democratic Party, and I have never heard of any man of what they call the 'reform faction' in South Carolina saying he would not do so, unless the Smith people, with their money, whisky, and bought-and-paid-for newspapers should be able to abolish the two-thirds rule in the Democratic convention, refuse to listen to any appeal from the South, and nominate Smith on his wet platform," in which event the Senator would advocate the same course which he advocated in his Bishopville speech, and which is reiterated in his letter here published. But "if the delegates from South Carolina in that convention participate in the nomination of a candidate for President and a candidate for Vice President, I shall not only vote for him or them but shall take the platform for them at such time and such places as the National Democratic Committee may request."

Senator BLEASE's opposition to Smith for the nomination is well known, but in discussing the agitation to change the rules of the Democratic Party in this State so as to permit a voter to participate in the Democratic primary and then support the presidential ticket of some other party, the Senator says that when one votes "in the primary that he should pledge himself to support the nominees of the party."

The Senator's letter is clear, concise, and a complete and definite statement of his position, which, he says, "I shall reiterate if I live to be in Columbia on the 16th of May." Senator BLEASE's letter speaks for itself, and nothing could be plainer or easier to understand than his words, and from this time on there should be no occasion for question by anyone as to where Senator BLEASE stands. He comes square out, as he always does.

His letter follows:

UNITED STATES SENATE,
Washington, D. C., March 28, 1928.

HON. JOHN K. AULL,
Columbia, S. C.

MY DEAR JOHN: Yours of March 27, in which you ask certain questions and inclose an article headed "Threatens to bolt Houston convention if Smith nominated," received.

I had already read this article and was very much amused at most of its contents.

In the first place, I have never thought of even attempting to exchange positions with Governor Richards. I will frankly state, however, that I would rather be Governor of South Carolina than to hold any other position in the world. But the majority of the people of South Carolina were kind enough to elect me to the United States Senate when I asked them to do so in 1924, and I have no intention of hereafter becoming a candidate for the governorship.

However, if such an emergency should arise that a majority of my people think that I should make the campaign in order to be of some special service to them, I would not hesitate a moment to do so, but I can not now even conceive of any such emergency arising; therefore I shall remain in the Senate, if God spares me health and life, until the end of my present term, March 4, 1931.

In the meantime I shall endeavor to do as I have been doing, advocate and vote for what I believe to be for the best interests of the people

of my State and this Nation, and render such service as I think would be acceptable to my people and to their and my God. If my services are satisfactory to a majority of my people, I care very little for the criticisms of "a bitter small minority," who can not get over their jealous rage at my having been elected to this exalted position. Neither shall I give any heed to the "small minority" who "want to get rid of BLEASE," "whom they cordially hate." As far as I can see ahead now, I shall be a candidate to succeed myself in the Senate.

That, of course, will be left in the hands of a majority of our people. If they indorse my course, all is well and good. If they have a man in the State who they think can be of greater service to them here, or who can accomplish more for them than I can, I want them to elect him, for they are entitled to the best, and no one would go further than I would to see that they get the best; and if some emergency should arise, some great question come before this country, and there was a man in South Carolina who could represent our State with greater ability or accomplish more for our State in this emergency I would not hesitate to do as Mr. Hayne did on one occasion, and step aside, he stepping aside to allow Mr. Calhoun to return to the Senate on such occasion as I mention.

As to the Democratic rules: I think that when a man goes to his club meeting and helps to elect delegates to his county convention, and the delegates so elected help elect delegates to a State convention, and the State convention elects delegates to the national convention, who participate in the nomination of candidates for President and Vice President, he, having participated in his club meeting, is just as much bound to support the action of the delegates elected by the State convention to the national convention as he is to support candidates for the United States Senate, Congress, State, and county offices when he votes in the primary at which they are nominated.

Therefore, I think when he votes in the primary that he should pledge himself to support the nominees of the party. If you don't do this, we will have confusion confounded. Why? Because men will vote in the primary, their candidate will be defeated, they will have no oath to bind them to support the nominee, and therefore would have no hesitancy in voting for their candidate in the general election against him who had been nominated by the party in the primary, and I know of no quicker way to ruin the united democracy of our State than to invite such a split and appeal to the negro for the balance of power as was done in 1890 and on other occasions.

It is strange to me how some people who bolted the party in 1890 and who again bolted in 1896 and 1900, when Mr. Bryan was the nominee, have all at once become so solicitous about the rules of the party to-day.

Now, as to a bolt as mentioned by this man in his newspaper article which you inclosed me, I will simply state that he is just another common Yankee liar, because both Governor Richards and myself have time and again said that we would support Mr. Smith if he were the nominee of the Democratic Party, and I have never heard of any man of what they call the "reform faction" in South Carolina saying that he would not do so, unless the Smith people with their money, whisky, and bought-and-paid-for newspapers should be able to abolish the two-thirds rule in the Democratic convention, refuse to listen to any appeal from the South, and nominate Smith on his wet platform; then, as I said in my Bishopville speech, "I favor the southern delegates to the next Democratic National Convention standing up in that convention and demanding to be represented and demanding that what they favor be written in the platforms of the party, and if the two-thirds rule be abolished and their demands are not agreed to, that they withdraw from that convention and hold a simon-pure Democratic convention and invite all of the citizens of the United States of America to join them in the election of their nominees and not allow mugwumps and camouflaged so-called Democrats to control the Democratic convention—men who do not want the Democrats to succeed but want both Democratic and Republican candidates from their own crowd, so it matters not which gets in, they win and the people lose. As I suggest, if anyone is to bolt, let it be them and not us. Why let delegates from States that never have and never will give the Democrats an electoral vote name whom we shall vote for and what issues we shall advocate?"

Now, this is not a bolt. If the delegates from South Carolina in that convention participate in the nomination of a candidate for President and a candidate for Vice President, I shall not only vote for him or them but shall take the platform for them at such time and such places as the Democratic National Committee may request.

As to your next question, I don't care to have much to say about it; it is so amusing. Any man has a right to announce for governor who pleases, and if I wanted to be governor, I would not want any easier campaign than to be opposed in South Carolina by a man who is in favor of Al Smith for President and a whisky platform.

I shall be at the May convention if I am living, not with any intention of dictating to anybody or of even attempting to influence anybody, but merely to be of such service as I may be able to render to my people and to my party.

I want South Carolina to adopt a good strong platform, a State-rights platform, for the enforcement of all laws, against the repeal or modification of the eighteenth amendment or the Volstead law, denouncing corruption and extravagance in government, and making plain that she wants what she has always stood for—white supremacy, home rule, a belief in the doctrine of Jesus Christ and in His divinity.

I hope that the delegates, whoever they may be, will not be instructed to vote for any candidate but instructed to vote against any man who stands for or advocates the repeal of or the modification of the eighteenth amendment or the Volstead and kindred acts, and that they will choose a clean, able, honorable, outstanding American citizen as their nominee for President and a like one as their nominee for Vice President, and vote as a unit and work for such candidates and such platform.

Speaking of a bolt, will Smith and those who are advocating his nomination support wholeheartedly the candidate nominated if it be not Smith?

I have spoken plainly, possibly a little too plainly, but that has been one of the rules of my life, let the consequences be what they may, and what I have written you here you may publish in any newspaper you please, for I shall reiterate it if I live to be in Columbia on the 16th of May.

Very respectfully,

COLE L. BLEASE.

[From the Anderson Independent (the paper the people read), Tuesday morning, March 27, 1928]

BLEASE BROUGHT US PESTILENCE, WEEVILS, AND ALL; NOW LOOK!

MR. EDITOR: I have just read a remarkable article in the Greenville News from the distinguished capitalistic newspaper, the Charlotte News, in which it says "Bleasism in saddle." In this article the woefully ignorant Tar Heel editor blames Bleasism for driving Dr. S. C. Mitchell away from the University of South Carolina years ago; now, says the North Carolinian, Dr. D. M. Douglas is threatened with Bleasism. These are the implied statements in the brilliant article copied in the Greenville News, which is opposed to anything BLEASE has, will, or may do, has zealously copied in its columns.

Now, of course, to be perfectly frank, we South Carolinians all know that COLE BLEASE brought the Jim Crow law, lynchings, high-priced guano, low-priced cotton, the hookworm, bollworm, corn borer, spinal meningitis, side pleurisy, antagonism, factionalism, disease, pestilence, floods, and famines to this State. This is general knowledge as spread around by the partisan press. If BLEASE had never been born this State would never have had tornadoes and floods, etc., and the two dry years, 1925 and 1926, were providential measures against the régime of Bleasism in this State.

Everything bad this State has ever had was caused by BLEASE. Too bad, too bad.

It's an awful situation: Christ was born in a stable, COLE BLEASE worked in one when he was a boy, and Carolina is hell bent because of the latter. Of course, BLEASE has never been accused of stealing or robbing or thievery while in office; and if he hadn't put the cury-comb on the backs of some of the plutocratic jackasses in this State he would be classified as a "statesman." Any man who wants to be called a statesman in South Carolina can be one if he will let the Columbia State, Columbia Record, Greenville News, and News and Courier tell him how to run the State for the benefit of the respective classes they represent; if he tries to represent the masses, then he is a rank failure and a rotter in the sight of God.

The newspapers frequently tell us how BLEASE "is tolerated," or how the State has put up with him, and what a disgrace he is to the State; but the outstanding question is, Who the hell are the newspapers? What prior claim on the standards of weights and measures of morals, public leadership, and ability can the newspapers produce? Because a man happens to own a newspaper is no sign he isn't a fool, and the official who tries to please the press of this State may expect ruin and disaster. BLEASE has ignored the press and has enjoyed almost entirely an undivided antagonism among the papers, yet he has been elected to more public offices than any South Carolinian.

So far as the North Carolina tumblebug is concerned, I advise to back up and get another load; he ought to be a good hauler judging from his experience!

Z. V. MENSLEY.

FARM RELIEF

The Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 3555) to establish a Federal farm board to aid in the orderly marketing and in the control and disposition of the surplus of agricultural commodities in interstate and foreign commerce.

Mr. MAYFIELD obtained the floor.

Mr. ASHURST. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. GOODING in the chair). Does the Senator from Texas yield to the Senator from Arizona? Mr. MAYFIELD. I yield.

Mr. ASHURST. The able Senator from Texas is about to deliver a speech on one of the most important subjects that can come before the Congress. The Senator's service here has demonstrated that he has a grasp of this question that is not equaled by that of any other person in the Congress. I ask for order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Senators will take their seats, and the Senate will be in order. The Senator from Texas will proceed.

Mr. MAYFIELD. Mr. President, no Senator can longer doubt that a new determination of the Nation's policy toward agriculture is the most important task that has confronted the country in the past decade. The men and women who produce the raw materials on which our industrial existence and, indeed, the very life of the Nation depend, are operating at a great disadvantage compared with the more closely knit economic groups in industry, commerce, and finance. We can neither avoid nor efface the evidences of this disparity.

The greatest problem before the American people to-day is the restoration of agriculture to a permanent, remunerative basis.

The industrial conference board of New York city, composed of the best economists that the country affords, reveals to us the seriousness of our national farm problem when it states that for the last 40 years the wholesale prices received for agricultural products have not even covered the cost of production. This simply means that since 1887 our farmers have been producing at a loss. In 1910 the farm indebtedness of the United States was \$4,000,000,000, but had increased to \$12,000,000,000 in 1920, and has been steadily increasing since that time. An investigation into the bank failures of our country shows that since 1920 more than 2,000 bank failures have occurred in agricultural States. On April 21 last year the Department of Agriculture announced that the farm population of our country decreased 649,000 persons in 1926, which is the largest decrease in any year since 1920. During the last seven years farm values in the United States have decreased \$23,000,000,000, while other property values have increased over \$50,000,000,000. In the face of these facts it passes my understanding how anyone can minimize the seriousness of agricultural conditions that exist in our country to-day, or seriously contend that there is no agricultural problem to be solved.

The presidents of our banks, the managers of our automobile concerns, the presidents of our railway companies, the stockholders of our mercantile establishments, and the managers of all our industrial and manufacturing enterprises have long since realized that the prosperity of their business depends very largely upon the prosperity of the producers of the Nation. As the financial barometer of the farmers goes down, so goes the financial barometer of the cities and towns that are dependent on agricultural areas.

It has been truly said that our cities may burn to ashes, but if the agricultural areas surrounding them remain prosperous the cities will be rebuilt more beautiful than before, but leave the cities prosperous and reduce to penury the agricultural areas surrounding the cities, and it will not be long until weeds will grow in the streets of the cities. The agricultural problem is, therefore, a national one and affects all our people alike. This being true, I have not felt that I was supporting class legislation when I have given enthusiastic support to every measure coming before the Senate that I concluded would bring even the remotest relief to the farmers of our country.

The most painstaking and unprejudiced economic surveys that have been made in any field for a generation confirm the stories of decreasing farm values and increasing farm debts that come to us who are privileged to represent agricultural States. With my distinguished colleague, I have the honor of representing in this body a State which is probably more widely concerned in securing an abatement of the difficulties that surround the business of farming than any other State in the Union, because Texas is preeminently an agricultural State with an area of land in farms more than double that of any other State. The total value of crops produced in Texas, according to the last agricultural census, is nearly twice that of any other State, while within its borders the number of farms exceeds by more than 50 per cent the number of farms in the second ranking State.

Each of the 465,000 farms in Texas is a distinct economic unit, independent in its productive operation from the others; these are all part of a grand total of more than six and a third millions such economic units in our country. Because of the vast number and wide diffusion of the farms in this country the farm problem can not be solved by trusts or tariffs or other forms of self-help or subsidy which industry has evolved for its own stabilization and protection. Many

phases of the problem are peculiar to agriculture and in our consideration of a remedy we must seek for that which is adequate and lasting.

Consideration of the agricultural problem naturally falls into three steps or stages: First, what is the condition of agriculture? Second, what are the causes? And, finally, what are the remedies?

Agriculture is a varied and diverse industry. It may languish in one section and prosper in another in the same season. That which causes loss and disintegration in one branch of farming may not be the cause which is resulting in ruin to another. The remedy that is proposed for one form of agriculture may not be equally effective as applied to another form. Then, too, remedies may be negative as well as positive. It is important that we discontinue or modify national policies that work to the disadvantage of farmers, but that in itself is not sufficient. We must attempt to develop a new policy that will assist farmers to enhance and stabilize agricultural prices.

For eight years the farmers of this country have been crucified by a 10 to 30 per cent disadvantage, compared with their pre-war position, in prices at which their products are exchanged for goods and services of others. This disadvantage is not a temporary passing phenomenon. It persists to-day. It is a disadvantage that will continue as long as farmers remain without effective bargaining power in the sale of their goods and as long as agriculture continues to be the outstanding example of an unorganized industry in an organized world. The fact and the extent of agriculture's disadvantage are now generally recognized. The first question—what is the condition of agriculture—requires no further reference. I could draw from the experiences of the sturdy and self-reliant farm men and women of my own State to make an appeal to sentiment or passion more moving, perhaps, than any economic discussion can be. I might dwell on social and political aspects that are inevitable companions of farm distress. I might draw from the pages of history the references necessary to fasten your attention on the significance that exists in the fact of a disintegrating agriculture in a rapidly industrializing state, but such is not the purpose of this discussion. I seek to explain to-day at least in part the purpose and meaning of the McNary agricultural surplus control bill, which the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry has reported favorably to the Senate, and which had my support in the Sixty-eighth and the Sixty-ninth Congresses.

Facts and figures have been presented within the last two years by the business men's joint committee, representing the United States Chamber of Commerce, and the National Industrial Conference Board, and also by the Association of Land-Grant Colleges and Universities of the United States, that prove beyond question the fact, the nature, and the extent of agricultural depression.

The causes of this admitted depression are varied, but out of eight years of debate and study of this question, extending throughout the country and consuming months of time in the Congress of the United States, a few major propositions have emerged on which there is general accord:

(a) Agricultural production can not and should not be centralized in gigantic corporations in order that production may be measurably regulated and the industry stabilized. Even if it were economically practical to thus reorganize the nature of our agriculture, the social consequences of reducing farmers to the status of hired laborers would be too widespread and unpleasant to contemplate with composure.

(b) Weather and other factors uncontrollable by man determine the aggregate volume of output from farms to a far greater extent than does acreage, which in a measure at least might be controlled by cooperative action of the farmers themselves.

(c) It is the actual or potential presence of crop surpluses in their several forms that renders ineffective the various devices that have been brought forward as aids to agriculture during the period of depression. Tariffs have failed to assist farmers materially because they are practically inoperative on surplus crops. Cooperative marketing is not effective as a means to stabilize markets because the risk and cost of handling surpluses bear down too heavily upon members in comparison with nonmembers.

(d) We have pursued and are pursuing national policies that increase the farmer's operating costs, that in turn add to his financial burdens.

(e) It is a national responsibility to help farmers to so control the marketing of their products that agriculture may, as far as possible, be freed from ruinous fluctuations and heart-breaking slumps.

It is in the consideration of remedies that opinions differ most widely, though it is only fair to say that the differences are more marked on the outside than the inside of farm circles. The organized farmers, particularly those whose business organizations have had some experience in attempting to handle crop surpluses, show a remarkably united front on this question.

Mr. President, I am in favor of action by the Senate along two general lines for the permanent betterment of the condition that surrounds the business of farming in the United States.

In one direction we must modify or amend our national policies which operate to the disadvantage of the farmers. This country should stop subsidizing increased production at least until we have helped farmers to a position to save themselves from the loss and ruin that are inevitable consequences of this increased competition within their industry. We should recast the provisions of the tariff with a definite view to improve the relative position of agriculture and livestock in comparison with other groups. There should be no discrimination between raw materials and finished products in the raising of revenue. A competitive tariff would give our farmers and livestock men a tariff on their raw products sufficiently high to equalize the difference in the cost of production of raw products in foreign countries that employ pauper labor. Without such a tariff our farmers and ranchmen will never be able to make a profit on the farm products and livestock that they produce. The farmer's share of the national freight bill is disproportionately heavy and should be reduced at the earliest possible moment. Manipulation of the prices of farm products through future exchanges should be prohibited at once. Our cotton farmers and wheat growers will never receive the real value of their cotton and grain as long as the prices of these products are controlled and dominated by gamblers through future exchanges. But when these and other reforms have been accomplished, the great task is still to be done. That task is to provide a method whereby the producers of our staple agricultural crops can secure for themselves benefits and advantages that are commensurate with the benefits and advantages which business and industry are securing for themselves through trusts, incorporated combinations, and trade associations. This can only be accomplished for agriculture by helping the farmers to handle their crop surpluses for their own stability and benefit, rather than to continue a system in which the surpluses enrich others at the farmers' expense.

It is of this last form of farm relief—the development of an effective system of surplus control in agriculture—that I speak more particularly at this time. I want to see the farmer in Texas get every cent of advantage that is economically obtainable in the price of his cotton, or wheat, or beef. I realize that he can not meet in one room or sit around a table with all of his fellow producers from other parts of the land. I realize that national surpluses can not be handled effectively in the interests of the producers by the voluntary action of local cooperatives, unless all who benefit from such voluntary action contribute in fair proportion to the costs involved in such an undertaking.

Before the farmers of my State can secure every cent of advantage which is economically obtainable in the prices of their products they must be brought into position where, if there is a tariff, they will receive its benefits just as industry does; they must be helped into position to demand for their cotton and other crops prices that cover the cost of producing those crops, plus a reasonable profit on their investment, just as industry would receive if the American cotton crop were the product of an organized industry. I want to see the Texas farmers placed in such a position that a surplus of any staple crop one year will not be allowed to smash down the price of that crop to a ruinous level, regardless of the fact that the entire crop will be needed before another 12 months goes by.

We are wasting time here if the legislation we enact is merely a temporary makeshift or sop thrown to the farmers just before election, which will soon demonstrate its uselessness or which later will be taken away. If we are to have permanent agricultural relief it must be based on principles that provide a firm and lasting foundation upon which farmers can develop their great cooperative and marketing associations, secure in the faith that they possess a bargaining power to match the power of those groups with which they now trade at such tremendous disadvantages.

The McNary measure contains a provision which in my judgment is necessary to place the farmers of this country in a position that will make them secure in their bargaining power and not dependent upon Treasury subsidies. It will not destroy private business. It will not compel farmers to join

cooperatives or sell their crops to a Government board. Under its operations farmers who are members of cooperatives can continue to sell through them, while farmers who are not can continue to sell when they please, where they please, and to whom they please. It will bring about orderly marketing, with the result that peak prices will not be so high nor depressed prices so low. It will produce a moderate level of prices that would cover cost of production, plus a reasonable profit on the farmers' labor and investment. It will finance, but not subsidize, their business organizations through loans and advances. Finally the measure opens a way for effective action on behalf of each commodity whose surplus problem demands united action, if periodical disaster is to be averted. American farmers have never been consulted about the prices they have received for their cotton and grain, but have been forced to sell on markets made by speculators and gamblers through futures exchanges. They have never been consulted about the prices of the things they purchased, but have paid whatever was demanded. Therefore, under this system, our farmers receive less for what they sell and pay more for what they purchase than any other farmers on the face of the earth. I have supported the McNary bill, because it will change the system under which our farmers have been made "hewers of wood and drawers of water."

It has been repeatedly declared that under the provisions of the McNary bill the Government itself will go into business and purchase crop surpluses. The statement is not only untrue but perfectly ridiculous. The measure merely provides that the Government shall loan the farmers \$250,000,000 with which they may retire the surplus of a crop from the market, and thereby secure a fair price for the remainder of the crop.

Since the war the Government has made outright gifts of \$30,000,000 for the relief of people in foreign nations.

After the war the Government gave the railroads, as provided for in the Esch-Cummins law, a straight-out subsidy of \$529,000,000, to enable them to earn war-time profits for the first six months following the return of the railroads to the owners.

After the war the Government loaned to foreign nations over two and one-half billion dollars.

And yet, Mr. President, when we ask that the Government loan our farmers not quite one-half as much as it actually gave the railroads, we encounter the severest criticism from the men who voted for the law that gave the railroads this subsidy of \$529,000,000.

It seems to me that if the Government can afford to give \$30,000,000 for the relief of people in foreign nations, and a little over one-half a billion dollars to the railroads, and then is generous enough to loan over two and one-half billion dollars to foreign nations, it certainly can afford to loan our farmers \$250,000,000, by which they hope to free themselves from industrial slavery.

The opponents of the McNary measure have centered their fire upon the equalization fee, and they have not hesitated to misrepresent it completely, both as to its nature and its effects. If all the misrepresentations about the equalization fee were made into iron links an inch long and welded together, they would constitute a chain that would belt the globe nine hundred and forty-seven times. The attack on the equalization fee has not come from the farmers but from those who do not want to see them possessed of an effective bargaining power, and who realize that the equalization fee is the one essential feature of the McNary bill that will give them such a power.

What is this proposed equalization fee in fact? A fund is required to finance marketing operations that may be necessary in acquiring, storing, and disposing of crop surpluses to protect the market for the remaining bulk of the crop. The equalization fee is merely the proportionate share which each bushel of wheat, for example, or bale of cotton that moves in commerce would contribute to this common fund.

In one form or another the practical counterpart of the equalization fee is in daily use in industrial operations and in State and local projects. When the steel corporation makes its foreign sales on one price level and its domestic sales on a higher level, its profits are necessarily less than they would be were it possible to sell the output, surplus and all, at the higher domestic price level. When an implement manufacturer stores his surplus goods in a warehouse until they can be sold at a price he thinks fair, he charges his business with the storage cost. It is worth the cost; in fact, it is necessary if the manufacturer is to keep his current market from being demoralized. The export sales of the steel corporation may show no profit in themselves, but they contribute to the profitable operation of the corporation as a whole. The entire business of the steel corporation absorbs the cost of maintaining the foreign

market for its surplus. The entire business of the implement manufacturer also absorbs the cost of storing and withholding any seasonal surplus that occurs. The cost and losses thus absorbed in industry are the practical equivalent of the equalization fee which the McNary measure proposes to make available for agriculture.

The 1925 agricultural census reports that there were 1,931,307 individual farmers who produced cotton in the United States. The problem and its remedy would be totally different if all the cotton in the United States were grown by 15 or 20 big planters or corporations. Such is the nature of agricultural production that these few planters or corporations could not control weather or pests any more than the individual farmers now do, but surely they would not dump all their cotton on the market in a big year of production regardless of the price.

Does anyone doubt that in some way or another each of these 15 or 20 producers would finally withhold from the market his proportionate share of any surplus which, uncontrolled, would impair the market for the entire crop and pay the costs incident to the operation in proportion to his interests, or that these few growers would accomplish the same purpose by arranging the marketing of their cotton through a single agency? There would be costs attached to withholding the surplus from the market and disposing of it under such a system, to be sure, but the costs on a small portion of a crop would be cheerfully incurred in order that the remaining portion of the crop could be disposed of in a sound and stable market and at prices fairly related to the producer's cost of production. The cost of handling the surplus in the case of the 15 or 20 growers would be the practical equivalent of the equalization fee proposed in the McNary bill for nearly 2,000,000 cotton producers.

There is nothing particularly difficult in the buying, storing, and selling operations which would be necessary in any program of the organized surplus control of agricultural products. Farmers with the assistance of the proposed Federal farm board have or can create cooperative marketing associations and business corporations capable of doing all the marketing involved in the program contained in the measure under discussion.

The question which we have to meet and which the McNary measure meets in a practical way is determining the source of the money with which to finance such surplus control operations as will be undertaken for the benefits of the whole crop. No one has yet attacked the equity of the provision of the bill which says that the funds to be used for the benefit of all the producers of a crop should be drawn proportionately from all the marketed units of the crop itself. Since the proposed legislation has been before the country and the Congress for discussion no one has proposed any substitute source of funds, if we except the vague suggestions heard from time to time that Federal funds should be used for this purpose, excusing the facts in the case with the argument that there will be no loss but rather only profits upon the surplus portions of the crop.

Conceding, therefore, the equity of the proposed method of financing farm stabilization through the equalization fee, then the only practical matters which remain for settlement are two—first, the determination of the amount of the fee to be collected during operations in any season upon a particular commodity, and, second, the selection of the most practical and least expensive method of collecting the fee. Some of the uncompromising opponents of the McNary measure have been so reckless in their statements to charge that in the case of cotton the equalization fee might amount to \$10 or \$15 a bale and that it would be collected from the farmer when he carries his cotton to the gin. Such statements are utterly preposterous and absurd. This is, indeed, a strange argument to be made by men who, at the same time, contend that in the case of cotton satisfactory results could be secured without any net loss whatever on the surplus operations.

The fee on cotton need be only enough to finance the storage and carrying costs of withholding the surplus from the market until the market is ready to take the surplus at a fair and reasonable price. The equalization fee of \$1 a bale on the cotton crop, collected as provided in the McNary bill, not from the farmer when he takes his cotton to the gin, but by the agent of the railroads when the cotton merchant ships his cotton, would raise \$15,000,000 a year, and according to the best authorities that amount would be ample and sufficient. The fee would be reflected in the price paid to the farmer for his cotton exactly as in the case of freight charges. It is true that the fee would be heavier in the years of a large surplus than in years when the surplus was small and easily handled, but if prices were held

reasonably stable in the face of a large surplus there would be no complaints against the collection of the fee. And if the fee in any season proved by experience to be either too large or too small, the subsequent fee would correct the margin of variation.

Unfair critics of the McNary measure have deliberately and intentionally endeavored to create the impression that the equalization fee is a tax levied on the farmers of the country for which they would receive no benefits whatever. This measure is called a farm-relief measure, and certainly it would not give relief to the cotton farmers of the South by collecting an equalization fee of even \$1 a bale from them without giving them something larger in return. And that is exactly what the McNary bill will do. Cotton farmers, if this measure were enacted into law, would receive ten times more in the way of an increased price for their cotton than the amount that would be deducted from the price to cover the equalization fee. Let me illustrate. Suppose there is a temporary surplus of cotton produced and the price declines to 15 cents per pound. Do you suppose there could be found a cotton farmer in the entire South who for a moment would object to the collection of an equalization fee of \$1 or \$2 a bale on cotton if the collection of such a fee would assist in raising the price of cotton to 20 cents per pound? Where is the farmer who would object to the collection of an equalization fee of \$1 or \$2 a bale on cotton if this would assist him in getting \$100 per bale for his cotton instead of \$50 a bale?

While the equalization fee would be collected, as I have pointed out, yet in the end it would not actually be paid by the farmers themselves, because it would be passed on to the consuming public. Senators representing the great consuming centers of the North and the East have known all the while that the enactment of the McNary bill into law would increase the price of cotton, wheat, corn, and hogs, and, no doubt, this fact has influenced them to a large extent in their opposition to the measure.

Many of the ablest students of agricultural problems seriously doubt that an equalization fee would ever be levied on cotton, because the mere fact that the Federal farm board was prepared to retire a temporary surplus of cotton from the market, if necessary, would in itself be sufficient to stabilize the market and give our farmers a fair and reasonable price for their cotton. The McNary measure simply sets up the machinery that will enable the farmers to control their own business. If the farmers themselves do not object to the collection of the equalization fee, which is necessary in order for them to get control of and manage their own affairs and to assist them in securing a fair price for their products, why should demagogic politicians object to giving the farmers what they want? Legislation of this character, as we know, is largely experimental. I do not claim that the McNary farm measure is a panacea for all our agricultural ills, but I do know that it points in the right direction and that is enough for me. I am willing to give it a trial. Surely we can lose nothing by doing that. If the McNary farm measure proves worthless, as its opponents claim it will, we can repeal it and will have lost nothing by having given it a trial. If, however, on the other hand it brings real, substantial relief to the farmers of the country, then we will have stabilized agriculture and will have brought a blessing to our farmers. Surely, Mr. President, the Congress can enact no legislation that will hurt the farmer, because he must now look up to see the bottom.

Well do we remember that in the early part of the fall of 1926 the price of cotton declined from 20 cents to 10 cents a pound within 30 to 60 days because it was reported that the South had produced 3,000,000 bales too much cotton. Most of the 1926 cotton crop sold below cost of production, and many thousands of industrious and hard-working farmers lost their farms and the savings of a lifetime. And why? Simply because nature had been kind to growing crops and brought forth a yield not greater than the world needed but greater than it was thought the world could consume in one year. Verily, the farmer's business is in such turmoil it seems that the more he produces the less he has.

Investigation has shown that there is no such thing as maintaining a surplus of cotton over a period of five years. One year there is a surplus but the next year it is wiped out by droughts, floods, or by the boll weevil and the bollworm. So it has been demonstrated that in a period of five years supply and demand are equalized. While occasionally we produce more cotton in one year than the world can consume in one year, yet we have never produced over a period of five years more cotton than the world needed and could consume during that time. The "carry-over" from year to year is not a true surplus; it is merely that part of the crop

not temporarily needed, but which will be needed to supply a deficiency in the years of smaller production.

If the McNary measure had been in effect in September, 1926, the cotton farmers of the South would have been saved not less than \$600,000,000, and the truth of the statement is easily established. When the farmers began marketing their cotton in the early part of September, 1926, the price of middling cotton was around 20 cents per pound. About that time it was reported that there would be a surplus of about 3,000,000 bales of cotton, and down went the price to 10 cents per pound within 30 to 60 days. If the McNary farm measure had been in effect at that time, the Federal farm board would have come to the rescue of the cotton farmers of the South and retired about 2,000,000 bales of the purported surplus from the market and our farmers would, undoubtedly have received 20 cents a pound for their cotton. Why? Because that was the price of cotton about June 1, 1927, and we had not produced one single bale of cotton in addition to the 1926 crop. While the cotton crop of 1926 was in the hands of the farmers it was a purported surplus that sent the price down to 10 cents per pound, but as soon as the farmers had sold their cotton and it had become the property of others the surplus disappeared and the price steadily advanced until it reached 20 cents per pound by June 1, 1927. Just here it will be well to remind the uncompromising opponents of the McNary measure that the cotton farmers of the South paid an equalization fee in 1926 of something like \$40 to \$50 a bale in the loss they sustained in the decline in the price of cotton because they had no machinery with which to handle the temporary surplus.

The only country that produces a surplus of cotton is the United States, and whenever there is a world surplus it is produced by our country. The surplus therefore determines the price. If we could withdraw from the market the temporary surplus of cotton raised in the United States, we would then regulate the supply with the demand and thereby stabilize the price of cotton upon the basis of the supply not exceeding the demand. It is therefore apparent that the one thing needed in the South to-day is the establishment of the machinery by which we can retire a temporary surplus of cotton from the market and hold that surplus until it is needed. This is the aim and purpose of the McNary measure, for which I voted twice in this body and which passed the last Congress, but was vetoed by President Coolidge. The Federal Government has spent multiplied millions of dollars encouraging our farmers to a greater production; from its Treasury has flowed untold millions for reclaiming swamp lands, for irrigating arid lands, for destroying agricultural pests and insects, all of which have resulted in increased production; and yet the Government has left our farmers without the machinery by which at least a moderate surplus can be carried forward until it is needed.

When we who want to help our farmers propose that the Government should assist them in setting up the necessary marketing machinery we are instantly met with the statement from representatives of certain selfish interests that the farmers should help themselves and that Government aid to the farmers would be the rankest kind of paternalism. That statement, Mr. President, would be more persuasive had the Federal Government not helped, assisted, and protected every other industry in the country.

Through the Interstate Commerce Commission the Government establishes freight rates that will yield the railroads of our country a reasonable profit on their investment, and the farmer must pay the same freight rates on 10-cent cotton as on 25-cent cotton. Through the Federal courts the Government says that gas companies, telephone and telegraph companies, water and light companies, and public utilities of every character are entitled to rates that will yield them 7 per cent profit on the value of their investments. Through the Adamson law, the transportation act of 1920, and the immigration law of 1924, the Government has given protection to organized labor of the country. The tariff law gives protection to the manufacturing interests and forces the farmer to pay tribute on everything he buys from a file to a threshing machine.

Over one-third of a century ago Congressman Kelly, of Pennsylvania, known as "Pig-Iron" Kelly on account of his steadfast devotion to a protective tariff on pig iron, after visiting several sections of the South, said:

It is the most glorious country upon which my feet or eyes have ever rested. It is to be the coming El Dorado of American adventure. The States south of the Ohio and east of the Mississippi, with their half-million square miles of area, contain in them wealth great enough for a continent, and wealth so vast, so varied in its elements and

character, so advantageously placed for development, that these States alone can sustain a population far greater than the population of the United States to-day.

The South produces a world necessity and should be the richest spot on the face of the globe, and yet our farms are plastered with mortgages and our people are impoverished and discouraged. Why? Because our farmers have not received governmental aid and protection. If cotton were produced in the New England States, the ingenuity of northern statesmanship would make the South pay 50 cents a pound for it. The railroads are prosperous. The public utilities are prosperous. Manufacturing is prosperous, and so is organized labor. Why? Because they have been given governmental aid, supervision, and protection. If it is sound public policy for the Government to protect the railroads that haul the farmers' cotton and the manufacturers that spin and weave it, I submit, Mr. President, that it is a sounder public policy for the Government to also protect the farmers that produce the cotton for the protected railways to haul and the protected manufacturers to weave.

A bale of cotton on a farmer's wagon represents just so much of the farmer's labor, and the efforts of the Government to help the farmer get a profitable price for his cotton is nothing more than the efforts of the Government to help him get a little better price for his labor. If it be paternalism for the Government to help the farmer secure a better price for his labor, then why is it not paternalism for the Government, through its commissions and courts, to guarantee a profit to public-service corporations of the country, and through its railway and immigration laws to give protection and help to organized labor in every other industry? England helps her rubber producers, Brazil her coffee producers, and Cuba her sugar producers, but we are told that it would be paternalism for America, the richest country on the face of the globe, to help her farmers, who have been producing at a loss for the last 40 years.

In studying the question of "carry-over" cotton, I concluded that it had much to do with depressing the price of cotton, and it occurred to me that legislation dealing with this question was of the greatest importance. Our cotton year runs from July 31 to August 1, and when it is estimated that there will be 5,000,000 bales of "carry-over" cotton on August 1, the general impression is that all of that cotton is tenderable on contracts of sale under the cotton futures act. This impression is quite misleading because under the cotton futures act only 10 grades of cotton can be tendered on future sales of contract, and most of the "carry-over" is low grade, dog-tail cotton, and does not fall within the 10 grades designated as tenderable cotton under the cotton futures act. And yet, a very large amount of low-grade, dog-tail, untenderable cotton has through the years acted as a lever to pull down the price of high-grade, commercial, tenderable cotton. It has had this effect and has exerted this influence because there has been no classification of the "carry-over" cotton by the Government.

The conclusion is therefore inescapable that it is of the greatest importance to the cotton growers of our country to know exactly the character of the "carry-over" cotton that is on hand in the mills, warehouses, and other establishments in the country on August 1 of each year.

When Congress convened in December, 1926, I introduced in the Senate a measure that authorized and directed the Secretary of Agriculture to make a general survey of all the "carry-over" cotton in the United States on the 1st day of August of each year, and to publish annually statistics concerning the grades and staple length of stocks of the cotton known as the "carry-over" or surplus. In the statistics, to be published by the Secretary of Agriculture, cotton which is tenderable on contracts of sale for future delivery under the law is to be reported separately from that which is untenderable under the law. I am glad to be able to say that I was successful in passing the measure through the last Congress and it received the approval and signature of the President. When the provisions of this law have been complied with, we will know exactly the character of the "carry-over."

When I introduced the cotton classification bill in the Senate in December, 1926, the price of cotton had reached the lowest level since 1921. Cotton farmers, bankers, and merchants throughout the entire South were clamoring for relief. At that time good cotton was selling for 10 cents per pound, but when the Committee on Agriculture of the Senate reported my bill favorably to the Senate, and it had been placed on the Senate calendar, the price of cotton began to advance, and by the time the bill had been enacted into law the price of cotton had advanced 3 cents per pound, or \$15 per bale. Far be it from me to say what effect the measure had upon the price of cotton, but

Mr. Theodore Price, editor of Commerce and Finance of New York City, one of the greatest experts and authorities on cotton in the world, directed attention to my cotton classification bill at the time it was introduced in the Senate, and is reported to have stated that the reaction to the downward trend of the cotton market was due to that measure.

Since under the provisions of the cotton classification act we are to know the number of bales of low-grade dog-tail cotton in the "carry over" that can not be tendered on contract of future sales under the law, it occurred to me that we should put forth our very best efforts to find new markets for this grade of cotton. I submit that one of the best ways to deal with the over-production or surplus of any commodity is to bring about an increased consumption of that commodity. Therefore, when the Agricultural appropriation bill came before the Senate last year I secured the adoption of an amendment to it that authorized and directed the Secretary of Agriculture to make a scientific investigation into the potential uses of cotton with the view of bringing about an increased consumption of that great commodity.

Under the provisions of my amendment, the Department of Agriculture has for several months been conducting the investigation, Dr. B. Youngblood, of our own agricultural and mechanics college, having been called to Washington by Secretary Jardine, of the Department of Agriculture, to superintend the investigation.

The investigation shows clearly that bagging made of low-grade cotton is in every respect preferable to the jute bagging. In the first place, the jute bagging does not protect the cotton as well as bagging made of low-grade cotton, because the meshes of the jute bagging are three-fourths of an inch and that much of the cotton is exposed to the weather. Cotton bagging is very closely woven and covers the cotton entirely, and yet it is porous enough to dry if it should become wet. Bagging made of low-grade cotton can be used several times as bagging by being rewoven into new bagging, but not so with jute bagging. As junk, bagging made of low-grade cotton can be used to make towels, laundry bags, rugs, carpets, and so forth, but the value of jute bagging as junk is almost negligible.

The expert authorities of the Department of Agriculture tell us that if we were to wrap the entire cotton crop of the South with bagging made of low-grade cotton instead of jute bagging, and if we would ship our rice, sugar, salt, corn, bran, oats, cement, potatoes, meats, and all other such commodities in sacks made of low-grade cotton instead of burlap sacks made of jute, and substitute the use of cotton manufactured fabrics for jute-manufactured fabrics we would create new markets for 2,000,000 bales of low-grade cotton. Doctor Youngblood and other authorities say that the creation of new markets for the consumption of an additional 2,000,000 bales of low-grade cotton would undoubtedly bring about an increase of 4 cents per pound in the price of cotton, or \$20 a bale, above that which our farmers would receive were the new markets for this additional amount of cotton not created.

If these statements are true, why, some one asks, has this situation been permitted to exist? There are several answers to that question. In the first place, our farmers have been led to believe that since they sold their cotton on gross weight and the jute bagging and ties were included in the weight of the cotton, they were therefore being paid for the bagging and ties at the price they received for their cotton; but, as a matter of fact, they have never received one cent pay for the bagging and ties with which their cotton is wrapped. Every farmer who carries a bale of cotton to the gin pays the ginner for the bagging and ties that go around his cotton. Nobody gives the farmer anything. The cost of the bagging and ties enters into the cost of producing cotton just like the cost of chopping, picking, and other necessary items of expense.

On cotton shipped to foreign countries the mills deduct 30 pounds from the gross weight of every bale of cotton, which by trade agreements is called the "tare," and is supposed to represent the weight of the bagging and ties around a bale of cotton. While the cotton merchant pays the farmer for the gross weight of his cotton, which includes the weight of the bagging and ties, the merchant knows that this tare of 30 pounds will be deducted from every bale of cotton that he sells to foreign mills, and therefore he protects himself accordingly and deducts from the price which he pays the farmer for the gross weight of the cotton a sufficient amount to cover this deduction of 30 pounds for tare. Therefore it is clearly evident that the farmer who produces the cotton does not receive one cent pay for the jute bagging and ties that cover his cotton, as is the general impression, but, on the other hand, he actually pays the cost of the bagging and ties.

In the next place, cotton bagging and cotton fabrics can not compete with jute bagging and jute fabrics, because jute is raised in far-away India by pauper labor and is manufactured into burlap and other fabrics by pauper labor. The jute-bagging trust has moved its mills to India in order to take advantage of the cheap labor of that country. The jute mills of India pay their carders 15 cents a day and their weavers, the highest-priced laborers, about 50 cents a day. There is not a bootblack in the United States who does not make more every day than the most skillful weaver makes a week in the jute mills of India. We can not bring about the substitution of cotton bagging and cotton fabrics for the use of jute bagging and jute fabrics unless we raise the tariff to such a point as will exclude jute bagging and jute fabrics from the United States, and we Democrats in the South have been opposed to such a course.

The present tariff law was written by the Republicans; it gives protection to the manufacturing interests of the East and leaves the agricultural industry of the South wholly unprotected. Our farmers are forced to buy in a protected market and to sell in a world-wide competitive market. In other words, the present tariff law places all the burdens of a high protective tariff upon the bending backs of our farmers, while it gives them none of the benefits of protection.

If it were within my power I would revise some of the schedules of the present tariff law downward until relief was given to the farmers of our country, but I do not possess that power. The Republican Party is in control of the legislative and executive branches of the Government, and as long as it continues in power a tariff law can not be written from a Democratic standpoint. If, however, the present high protective tariff law is to remain the fixed policy of our country, I think its provisions should be recast so that the cotton producers of the South will receive some of the benefits of the law and not be compelled to bear all of its burdens.

Mr. President, I am familiar with the agricultural conditions that exist in our country to-day. As a member of the Committee on Agriculture of the Senate I have heard representatives of the farmers describe conditions in the Corn and Wheat Belts of the Nation. I have heard representative farmers tell of the conditions that exist in the cotton States of the South. I have first-hand knowledge of conditions in the rural sections of Texas, because I have been among our farmers and am familiar with the hardships they endure. Over 20 years ago, as an organizer of the Farmers' Union, I visited the remotest rural communities of our State and became thoroughly convinced of the dire necessity of a change in the conditions of our rural life. The impressions made upon my mind have abided with me through the years.

I have seen the farmer's wife place her youngest child on a quilt beneath the shade of a tree and take her place by the side of her husband, plowing in the new ground that was thick with roots and stumps. I have seen her pulling the cotton sack down the long cotton rows early in the morning when the sun had not yet driven the dew from the leaves of the cotton, ruining her health, when she should have been in the home. I have seen the farmer's boys and girls under 10 years of age in the fields chopping corn and cotton when they should have been in school.

Why do such conditions exist in the cotton-producing States of the South to-day? Is it because the white farmers of the South prefer that their wives and children should work in the cotton fields? Ah, no. It is because conditions actually demand it. When the head of the family, together with his wife and children, work in the fields through the scorching rays of the sun and the wintry winds of winter, month in and month out, he then finds it difficult to make "tongue and buckle meet" and too often is compelled to borrow money in the fall with which to pay his taxes. I would be untrue, Mr. President, to the people of Texas, who have honored me with public office for more than 20 years, and I would be false to the very instincts of my nature did I not do everything within my power to bring about a change in these conditions.

When agricultural prices have been stabilized and agriculture itself has been placed upon a remunerative basis by the enactment of the McNary measure into law, our farmers will be happy and contented, because home ownership will have been made possible. Nothing contributes more to the security of the Republic than its homes and the sturdy, patriotic, God-fearing people that constitute its rural population. They are the base and foundation of our country's freedom, the bulwark of its prosperity, the source of its patriotism, and the citadel of its virtues.

Mr. President, behold the strength and glory of the Republic! Not its cities and towns that deck the land like jewels; not its

railroads that span the continent from ocean to ocean; not its commerce that floats upon the broad bosom of the seas; not the untouched stores of its virgin wealth that beckon the industry of man—not these—but her six and a third million farmers and ranchmen whose lands spread out in countless valleys and whose cattle range on unnumbered hills—these, sir, constitute the strength and glory of the Republic.

Our farmers and ranchmen are the strong pillars of the Government; they are the men who lighted the fires of liberty and who have kept them burning through the years; they found this land naked and clothed it; they found it hungry and gave it meat; they found it imprisoned in cities and invited it to the freedom of husbandry.

What calling or profession among men can point with such pride to sons who have sprung from such an environment? What nursery has nurtured men of such Spartan mold? From America's rural homes has come the fiber from which the loom of destiny has woven our greatest characters. Would we bring forth in the future sons and daughters worthy to inherit the glorious legends of the past—rear them in the pure air and simple habits of rural life "far from the madding crowd's ignoble strife"? Would we rear a race of patriots? In the short history of our country, the men who have lead the van of freedom's battles have left a plow standing in the field. Would we nourish the principles of religion and virtue? There is not under the shadow of the flag a more consecrated spot than the fireside of the farmer's humble home.

God grant that the time may soon come when the shackles that bind our farmers to industrial slavery will be broken—when the men and women who feed and clothe the people of the United States will walk out into the sunshine of blue heaven, as independent as our Government, as free as the air we breathe, as joyous as the springtime. To this beneficent consummation I consecrate myself to the end of my service in the United States Senate, whether that service be short or long, for I fully realize that—

Ill fares the land, to hastening ills a prey,
Where wealth accumulates and men decay;
Princes and lords may flourish, or may fade—
A breath can make them, as a breath has made;
But a bold peasantry, their country's pride,
When once destroy'd, can never be supplied.

Mr. MAYFIELD subsequently said: I ask unanimous consent to have the colloquies during my address published at the close of the address.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

During Mr. MAYFIELD's speech—

Mr. HEFLIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield right there?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. FRAZIER in the chair). Does the Senator from Texas yield to the Senator from Alabama?

Mr. MAYFIELD. I yield.

Mr. HEFLIN. The Senator is talking about the farmer's cotton being manipulated and the price of it fixed by the future exchanges, and he suggests that this ought not to be permitted. I heartily agree with him. Does the Senator know that you can not speculate upon the stock exchange in Pennsylvania Railroad stock unless that company agrees for you to speculate in it? You can not speculate in General Motors stock unless that company agrees for people to speculate in it; but they take the farmer's cotton and speculate in it when he is holding it off the market, hoping to get a profitable price, and he is not consulted at all; and they sell ten times the amount of the crop every season without the farmer ever having any say in it at all.

Mr. MAYFIELD. That is true. I am hoping that this Congress will pass legislation that will prohibit the manipulation of the prices of farm products in future exchanges. But we must do more than that.

Mr. HEFLIN. Mr. President, will the Senator permit me to suggest at this point that the price of cotton goods to-day would justify the farmer in receiving from 40 to 50 cents a pound for his cotton?

Mr. FLETCHER. Mr. President, may I ask the Senator from Texas a question? He said he would be willing to yield at the close of his speech.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Texas yield to the Senator from Florida?

Mr. MAYFIELD. I yield.

Mr. FLETCHER. After congratulating the Senator on his splendid address, of which I very strongly approve, getting back

to the bill itself, I desire to ask as to his view regarding the time when the equalization fee is to be paid. When is it to be levied and who is to levy it? Who fixes it, who determines it, and when and how is it to be paid? That seems to be a very important matter for consideration in connection with the bill.

Mr. MAYFIELD. Mr. President, my understanding is that the amount of the fee would be determined by the board, and in the case of cotton that it would be collected by the agent of the railroad.

Mr. FLETCHER. For the use of the board, I take it?

Mr. MAYFIELD. Yes.

Mr. FLETCHER. And the board is to determine the time when the surplus that is protected by the equalization fee is to be disposed of and the price at which it is to be sold?

Mr. MAYFIELD. That is correct.

Mr. FLETCHER. Mr. President, I wish to offer for the RECORD some communications which I have received on the subject of the pending measure. I shall not ask to have them read, but merely to have them inserted in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The communications are as follows:

ILLINOIS BANKERS ASSOCIATION,
Chicago, February 20, 1928.

To the Members of Congress:

Being firmly convinced that the agricultural situation is one that ought to have definite action at this session of Congress, the executive council of the Illinois Bankers Association passed a resolution indorsing the McNary-Haugen bill, as approved by the American Farm Bureau Federation.

Illinois is an agricultural State. Seventy-five per cent of its banks are in daily contact with those who operate farms. The bankers, therefore, feel that they have an intimate knowledge of the situation and that there is a disparity between agriculture and industry because of an artificial stimulation to the latter by prior Federal legislation. We can not hope for continued prosperity with agriculture being obliged to sell its products on a world basis, coming in competition with foreign markets, and to buy in the home markets benefited by a protective tariff.

We respectfully ask you to help enact the McNary-Haugen bill.

M. A. GRAETTINGER, *Secretary*.

AMERICAN FRUIT GROWERS (INC.),
SANFORD DIVISION,
Miami, Fla., March 29, 1928.

HON. DUNCAN U. FLETCHER,
Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.

McNARY-HAUGEN FARM RELIEF BILLS

DEAR SIR: Referring to Senate bill 1176 (McNary bill), House bill 7940 (Haugen bill), creating a Federal farm board, advisory council, revolving fund, etc., as well as a clearing house and terminal marketing association for cooperative associations' product.

We feel that this bill or any similar one would be a terrific mistake, and that the bill in question is not only basically wrong in principle but practically impossible to satisfactorily be placed in operation on a practical scale. In writing this we express not only our own feelings but that of a large group of growers who market their tomato crop in this territory through us.

We are speaking in particular as far as the bill refers to fresh fruits and vegetables. Our reasons are, we feel, well founded on a considerable number of years' marketing experience, and should you so desire we will be pleased to outline them in some detail; but unless you care to go further into the matter we will not burden you with these details.

Sincerely trust, however, that you will see your way clear to not only vote against this bill but to use your personal influence against it.

Very truly yours,

E. W. LINS, *Sales Manager*.

THE ARNOLD FRUIT CO. (INC.),
Jacksonville, Fla., March 21, 1928.

HON. D. U. FLETCHER,
Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: One of the associations to which we belong called to our attention the fact that apples are included in the products to be regulated by the bill known as the McNary-Haugen bill. The secretary of this association writes that recently, while in Washington, several Senators and Representatives expressed a real desire to hear from their constituents with their opinions in regard to this bill. I am taking the liberty of writing to you to express mine.

My objections to the bill in regards apples are:

First. Apples sold in export market are neither the size nor varieties which are wanted by the domestic trade.

Second. The bill is not wanted by successful apple growers who raise quality fruit and usually get satisfactory prices.

Third. Dumping on foreign markets a surplus bought by a Government board, which would probably know little, if anything, of apple handling, would disrupt the present export business in apples which it has taken years to build. It would prevent foreign buyers from coming here, as they now do, with their money, purchasing a large percentage of the apple crop. They would not purchase when prospects were that their market would be glutted with improperly graded and undesirable fruit bought by the equalization board.

Fourth. The law would tend to increase the production of poor, off-grade fruit, especially by persons with political influence, who could sell their poor production at good prices to buyers for a political board.

Fifth. All attempts to interfere with natural laws of economics have proved a failure. If the farmers did not have to buy tariff-protected goods, they would not need help. If the farm-loan banks did not provide cheap money for a lot of nonfarmers to grow crops for domestic consumption (tomatoes on our east coast, for instance) those farmers who were capable could make a very successful living without protection or help.

Sixth. If Congress really wants to help those farmers, the price of whose products depends on world markets, why not put a bonus on exports? This would directly increase the farmers' price the amount of the bonus, as domestic users would have to pay the foreign price plus the bonus or not get the goods. This, domestic users, protected by tariff, should be able to afford if the contentions of high protectionists are true.

Very truly yours,

H. V. ARNOLD.

FLORIDA CITRUS EXCHANGE,
Tampa, Fla., March 19, 1928.

HON. DUNCAN U. FLETCHER,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR FLETCHER: This organization is very much interested in the Haugen bill (H. R. 7940), particularly the provisions thereof in regard to loans to cooperative organizations. We think it vital that something should be done along these lines and the provisions of the bill should be such that there would be no question of our being able to avail ourselves of them.

We would, therefore, ask that you kindly keep us advised of the situation as it concerns the passage of this legislation, with suggestions as to anything we might do to assist. If you think it advisable at any time for a member of our organization to come to Washington, we should be very glad to have someone go there.

Yours very truly,

FLORIDA CITRUS EXCHANGE,
A. H. BLANDING,
Production Manager.

AMERICAN FRUIT GROWERS (INC.),
SANFORD DIVISION,
Sanford, Fla., March 31, 1928.

Senator DUNCAN U. FLETCHER,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR FLETCHER: Referring to Senate bill No. 1176 and House bill No. 7940, known as the McNary-Haugen farm relief bills, we are of the opinion that it would be impossible to apply the provisions of those bills to perishable products, such as fresh fruits and vegetables. Owing to their perishable nature, these products can not be classed with staple crops like wheat, corn, and cotton and should be treated separately.

There is not only a multiplicity of fruit and vegetable crops, but there is a multiplicity of varieties, grades, and sizes within each crop. Some varieties and grades may be suitable for temporary storage, while others must go into immediate consumption, and some may be suitable for export while others (in fact, the bulk of the crops) would not. The enforcement of the provisions of these bills would be very difficult, if not impossible, without working a hardship on fruit and vegetable growers.

The tax which these bills would impose can not, in our opinion, be applied equitably. The best varieties and grades would bear the burden which might even result in the encouragement of undesirable production. Furthermore, the apple growers of New York State, for example, can largely market their crops within the State and avoid the tax, while the Virginia growers must necessarily ship the bulk of their crops in interstate and foreign commerce, and therefore be subject to taxation.

We respectfully request that in the interest of the fruit and vegetable growers of the South you endeavor to have these bills so amended as to exclude fresh fruits and vegetables. We shall greatly appreciate whatever you can do in this connection.

Yours very truly,

AMERICAN FRUIT GROWERS (INC.),
W. M. SCOTT, Division Manager.

(Care of Mr. W. H. Baggs, Pittsburgh, Pa.)

Mr. BROOKHART obtained the floor.

Mr. BLAINE. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Iowa yield to the Senator from Wisconsin?

Mr. BROOKHART. I do.

Mr. BLAINE. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Ashurst	Edge	Kendrick	Shortridge
Barkley	Edwards	Keyes	Simmons
Bayard	Fletcher	King	Smith
Bingham	Frazier	McMaster	Steck
Black	George	McNary	Steiwer
Blaine	Gerry	Mayfield	Stephens
Blease	Gillett	Neely	Swanson
Borah	Glass	Oddie	Tydings
Bratton	Goff	Overman	Tyson
Brookhart	Gooding	Phipps	Wagner
Broussard	Gould	Pittman	Walsh, Mass.
Bruce	Hale	Ransdell	Walsh, Mont.
Capper	Harris	Reed, Pa.	Warren
Caraway	Harrison	Robinson, Ark.	Waterman
Copeland	Hawes	Sackett	Wheeler
Couzens	Hayden	Sheppard	
Curtis	Heflin	Shipstead	

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. COUZENS in the chair). Sixty-six Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present. The Senator from Iowa [Mr. BROOKHART] is recognized.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Iowa yield to me to present a unanimous-consent request?

Mr. BROOKHART. I yield.

CHILD HEALTH DAY

Mr. BARKLEY. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of Senate Joint Resolution 89, which is on the calendar.

Mr. REED of Pennsylvania. May the joint resolution be reported?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Secretary will read the joint resolution.

The joint resolution (S. J. Res. 89) designating May 1 as child health day was read.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the immediate consideration of the joint resolution?

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, may I ask if the joint resolution has been reported from a committee?

Mr. BARKLEY. Yes, sir; it has been reported favorably from the Committee on Education and Labor.

Mr. BORAH. Is the effect of the joint resolution to make May 1 a legal holiday?

Mr. BARKLEY. No, sir; it is not. There is no appropriation and no effort to make any legal holiday. It simply calls attention to that day as a suitable day in the year to promote child health.

I will say that this joint resolution is backed and requested by practically all the civic organizations of the United States, including the Federation of Women's Clubs, the Red Cross, the Boy Scouts, the American Federation of Labor, and some 25 or 30 similar organizations throughout the country.

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President, I have no desire to object to a joint resolution which merely results in displaying the American flag upon a particular day, if that is what it is; but I do object if it has, or is intended to have, the effect of creating a legal holiday.

Mr. BARKLEY. It does not do that; and I will say to the Senator that I would not be for it myself if that were the effect of it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the joint resolution?

Mr. BRUCE. Mr. President, as I understand, this is not one of those measures which call for "the old flag and an appropriation."

Mr. BARKLEY. No, sir.

Mr. BRUCE. I should like to ask the Senator what is the constitutional authority of Congress with regard to the matter?

Mr. BARKLEY. The same constitutional authority that it has to adopt a joint resolution setting apart a certain Sunday to be known as Mother's Day by proclamation of the governors of the States. There is no inhibition in the Constitution against it.

Mr. BRUCE. No, there is not; that is undoubtedly the fact; but I can not see that Congress has any constitutional power to pass such a joint resolution, and I thought possibly the Senator could point to some such power.

Mr. BARKLEY. It has adopted similar resolutions with reference to other matters. This is not going to do any harm to the Government. It is simply a recognition of that one day in the year which all the patriotic associations desire to devote to the promotion of child health.

Mr. BRUCE. What attracted my attention was the fact that the joint resolution proposes to have Congress set aside a day for this purpose, and thereby interferes with the domestic life of the States.

Mr. BARKLEY. No; the State health authorities and many of the governors of the States have written me urging that this joint resolution be passed as an encouragement to their efforts in the States.

Mr. BRUCE. I must admit that it is not a very violent interference with the States.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield, I should like to know what authority the President of the United States has to go into the States and recommend to the people of the States that they shall display the flag. If the governors of the States or the legislatures of the States want to set aside a child-health day, there can be no objection; I would be quite in favor of it.

Mr. BARKLEY. There is no specific constitutional provision that authorizes anything of the sort, but certainly there is no constitutional objection to it. The President issues a proclamation with reference to Thanksgiving, which is made a legal holiday; he issues proclamations about other days that are observed; and I can think of no worthier object for a national day of observance, not as a holiday but simply to call the attention of the whole people to the desire for cooperative and patriotic efforts along this line.

Mr. KING. Undoubtedly the States and the people within the States have plenary power over those matters. I agree entirely with the Senator from Maryland that this is merely one of those movements in the interest of this irresistible plan to have the Federal Government—

Mr. BROOKHART. Mr. President, if this matter is going to lead to debate I must ask that it be withdrawn.

Mr. BARKLEY. I hope the Senator will not object, because the States are doing this now; but they are asking that it be recognized all over the country as a universal day, so that all the States may cooperate in its observance.

Mr. KING. I think it is a very improper thing for the governors of the States to importune Congress to help them set apart a particular day for observance within their own States.

Mr. BARKLEY. This merely contributes to the uniformity of observance.

Mr. KING. Uniformity is not what is desired. There is too much uniformity. There is too much of the stereotyped in our educational system and everything else. If we had a little more differentiation and less uniformity in this country, it would be far better for us.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Utah object?

Mr. KING. I do not object, but I shall vote against the joint resolution.

Mr. BLEASE. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Iowa yield to the Senator from South Carolina?

Mr. BROOKHART. I yield if it does not lead to debate.

Mr. BLEASE. It will lead to debate, because I am going to speak against the joint resolution.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator object to the immediate consideration of the joint resolution?

Mr. BLEASE. If the Senator from Iowa objects to taking up his time, I object to its immediate consideration.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I did not desire to take the Senator off his feet for a long discussion of this matter; and for the present I will withdraw the request.

Mr. BARKLEY subsequently said: Mr. President, I renew my request for the consideration of Senate Joint Resolution 89, designating May 1 as child health day.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the joint resolution?

There being no objection, the joint resolution was considered as in Committee of the Whole.

The joint resolution had been reported from the Committee on Education and Labor with an amendment, in section 2, page 2, line 10, before the words "child health day," to strike out "May day," so as to make the joint resolution read:

Whereas the quality of the adult citizenry of a country depends upon the opportunities for wholesome development provided in childhood; and Whereas in order to secure such well-rounded development it is essential that provision be made for a year-round child-health program; and

Whereas the concentration of the public mind on the necessity of such a year-round program can be effectively achieved by setting aside one day for this purpose as "child-health day": Therefore be it

Resolved, etc., That the President of the United States is hereby authorized and requested to issue a proclamation calling upon the Government officials to display the United States flag on all Government buildings, and the people of the United States to display the flag at their homes or other suitable places on May 1 of each year, in order to awaken the people of our country to the fundamental necessity of a year-round program looking toward the protection and the development of the physical and the mental health of our children.

Sec. 2. That May 1 shall hereafter be designated and known as child-health day and that it shall be the duty of the President to request its observance as provided in this resolution.

The amendment was agreed to.

The joint resolution was reported to the Senate as amended, and the amendment was concurred in.

The joint resolution was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

The preamble was agreed to.

FARM RELIEF

The Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 3555) to establish a Federal farm board to aid in the orderly marketing and in the control and disposition of the surplus of agricultural commodities in interstate and foreign commerce.

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. COUZENS in the chair). Does the Senator from Iowa yield to the Senator from Idaho?

Mr. BROOKHART. I yield.

Mr. BORAH. I wanted to ask the Senator in charge of the bill a question which he can answer by a simple yes or no, perhaps; I do not want to take the time of the Senator from Iowa if it can not be answered in a word. As I read the bill, and as I understand it, so far as the legal propositions relative to the equalization fee are concerned, there is no change in the pending bill from the former measure.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, I said yesterday in discussing the bill that there had been some amplification in the declaration of policy, which, in my opinion, strengthened it, so far as its basis being the commerce clause of the Constitution was concerned, to that extent, and to that extent only.

Mr. BORAH. Very well.

Mr. BROOKHART. Mr. President, at this time I desire to discuss briefly only the matters that will be in issue between the bill as offered by the Senator from Oregon [Mr. McNARY] and the substitute which I have offered myself.

First, I want to describe something of the size and the magnitude of this proposition. I think we are all agreed that, so far as marketing farm products is concerned, the control of the surplus in the United States is the important proposition. That is not all of the farmer's troubles, by any means. That is only a fraction of the cause of the present agricultural situation. But I will confine my discussion to that proposition, and that alone.

First, I look upon that proposition as if it were one big American farm. As far as Congress is concerned it is our farm, and we are producing a surplus, and that surplus is depressing our domestic market. The problem for us is to control that surplus, so that we can get our cost of production plus a reasonable margin of profit, to which all business is entitled. I hold that that is fundamental in this question.

What is the size of this surplus, to begin with? We are exporting, on an average, about \$2,000,000,000 worth of farm products every year. Those products are not altogether in the condition in which they left the farm. A considerable portion has been processed. Perhaps it was about \$1,200,000,000 in value, according to the present price, as it left the farm. The other \$800,000,000 was added by the processes of manufacture in one way and another. The biggest addition in value is to livestock products, through the packing companies.

We as a Congress have this \$2,000,000,000 surplus to handle, to dispose of, to remove from the domestic market if it is not going to depress the domestic market. I think we are all agreed that if prosperity returns to the farm, it must return by giving the farmer a better price in the domestic market than he has in the world market, upon the same basis that manufacturers, by the protective tariff, are given a higher price level in the United States.

That being true, the first question we will have to determine is as to how much finance will be necessary to handle this surplus. I think in handling that surplus, too, we must consider the effect of our method of handling it upon the world market itself. I think it would be disastrous, for instance, to take cotton and dump it into the world market for any sort of price we might receive at the dumping time. The same is true of wheat, and, in fact, of all farm products.

I think it will be conceded by anyone who has studied the world market in wheat that the Canadian pool has not only stabilized but has advanced and raised the world market for wheat. Yet the percentage of wheat placed in the world market by Canada is far below the percentage of cotton placed in the world market by the United States. However, the percentages would not be far apart if the Americans had a pool, and would join their surplus wheat, cooperate, as it were, with the Canadian pool, and seek the same means of improving the world market for wheat.

Therefore I have proceeded to figure out my substitute on the theory, not that we would dump these surplus products into the world market as our manufacturers sometimes have done with their surplus, but that we would hold the surplus to improve the world market itself.

Let us see about cotton. We are exporting over half of the cotton we produce in the United States. I am not sure as to the proportion that is in the world market, but I think it is over 60 per cent. The Senator from Idaho [Mr. GOODING] says it is 65 per cent. If that be true—and it is substantially true, I have no doubt—then it is apparent to Congress, as the big farmer producing 65 per cent of the world's exportable cotton, that the moment we collect that cotton together under one agency, properly financed, that moment we will be in substantial control of the world market.

Of course, if we advance the price unduly and unreasonably, the world will look for substitutes, and we will fail; but if we ask merely our fair cost of production, or average cost of production, and add to it, as I have done in this substitute, a demand for a 5 per cent return on the farmer's capital investment, the world will pay that price, and there will be no occasion for one dollar's loss upon the handling of the cotton surplus of the United States.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, will the Senator permit an interruption?

Mr. BROOKHART. I yield gladly.

Mr. KING. The Senator indicated that with 65 per cent production of cotton in the United States, if that were controlled by one agency in the United States, it would control the world price. Does the Senator think it a wise thing for a corporation to have such tremendous power? I recall a few months ago when it was charged that Great Britain controlled the rubber output, and we announced it as a great crime, and there was tremendous agitation in the United States against the monopoly of Great Britain, and the evils which it was alleged resulted.

What I want to ask is this: Does the Senator believe it is wise—and I am asking for information, to get the Senator's view—to aid in the creation of a world monopoly, or of a monopoly in the United States, that could fix the price, particularly of a commodity that is so essential to the life and the welfare of the people as cotton or wheat or corn or pork is?

Mr. BROOKHART. Mr. President, I think the Senator's question is a very proper one, and a very important question. I am glad to point out the way I have treated that in my substitute.

Unless that power is defined and controlled, it should not be granted to any board, and I have defined it and controlled it in this way, by holding that price down to a level where it will yield only a 5 per cent return on the investment in the cotton farms of the United States. That is the strongest, the surest, the easiest, and the most successful regulation that can be written into any law. That is the cooperative limit. It is the cooperative idea that controls capital earnings wherever cooperation is practiced in the world.

A great argument is made here against any bill that contains a provision for Government price fixing. I want no Government price fixing, but I do want price fixing according to

the honest and fair cost of production, and every business in the United States, every successful business in the world, fixes its prices in that way.

I want to say, further, to the Senator that the principle was unanimously approved by the Corn Belt committee in its session when I was present, but the leaders who have formulated the pending bill have refused to stand for that idea, which the farm organizations back home have ordered them by their resolutions to put into the bill. So, instead of price fixing, according to the cost of production, as all business fixes its prices, the McNary bill provides for the fixing of a price according to competitive conditions as they exist at the time.

I did not think anybody could write a farm bill that I would ever vote against, but unless we can get rid of that idea in the McNary bill, I think I shall have to vote against it.

On page 12 the wording is this:

The price at which a surplus or any part thereof is to be purchased or disposed of under any marketing agreement shall not be fixed in such agreement, but all such purchases and disposals shall be made subject to the prevailing competitive conditions of the markets in which they occur.

That is exactly what we have now. Those are the conditions that have stricken down agriculture, and driven it into bankruptcy.

To illustrate, I hold in my hand a Sheaffer pen. Everybody in these times knows the Sheaffer fountain pen. Walter A. Sheaffer was a schoolmate of mine, and I have known him all my life. I saw him in August of last year, and he held up one of these pens and said to me:

I am now the biggest manufacturer of pens in the United States. I am producing 20 per cent of all the fountain pens used in the United States. I have a plant and a force of people here at Fort Madison, Iowa, producing these pens. I put on a steady stream of production the year around each year in order to keep my plant and my force efficient, and I produce each year about 10 to 15 per cent more pens than I can sell in the United States. I do not let that surplus affect my market in the United States, because I have certain tariff protection on the ingredients used in these pens, and I have more patent protection against all the world. Therefore I box up my surplus and send it abroad. I sell most of it in Canada, without profit, at a lower price level than I am able to get in the United States.

Steel is doing the same thing, aluminum is doing the same thing, and on yesterday even the Senator from Indiana quoted President Gary, of the United States Steel Corporation, to that effect in reference to steel products.

Mr. Sheaffer said to me:

The American farmer is the one big producing manufacturer in the United States producing a surplus of only about 10 per cent, not more than I do of my pens, but that little surplus in the main is going abroad, is sold in the competitive markets of the world, its price is fixed by that sale, and the price is cabled back to the cotton exchange or the board of trade, and fixes the price of the whole product in the United States, the same less the expense of reaching the foreign market.

Mr. Sheaffer said, and I think fairly, and I think the manufacturers of the United States ought to see this farm problem in the same way, that agriculture can never again have prosperity in the United States, until agriculture, like the manufacturing industries, can have an American price level independent of and above the world price level.

I agree with that analysis of this situation, and I have formulated my substitute with some idea of the size of the proposition to bring about that result.

Let us take cotton. That is the biggest item of export. The President said in his veto message on the other bill that \$250,000,000 was not enough to handle cotton alone, and he was right. At the time of the big surplus I estimated that it would take \$500,000,000 to handle that surplus alone.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Iowa yield to the Senator from Georgia?

Mr. BROOKHART. I yield.

Mr. HARRIS. I would like to know how much would be provided under the bill of the Senator from Oregon? The way some of us understand it, there will only be \$25,000,000 provided, and the President in his veto message said, as the Senator has just remarked, that \$250,000,000 was not enough for cotton alone.

Mr. BROOKHART. I would prefer that the Senator from Oregon [Mr. McNARY] should answer that question, if he will.

Mr. McNARY. The bill provides for a revolving fund of \$250,000,000. How much would be used for cotton alone would

be controlled by the judgment of the board. The sum of \$25,000,000 is permitted for the purpose of furnishing and establishing facilities to be used by all cooperative organizations producing any of the basic agricultural products. I do not know what amount would be used, but it is in the nature of a revolving fund, and the turnover would be very quick some years, and some years not so rapidly, but the board would use enough money to take care of the cotton proposition.

Mr. BROOKHART. What is the \$25,000,000 for?

Mr. McNARY. For the purpose of acquiring facilities in connection with the cooperatives.

Mr. BROOKHART. And not for marketing itself?

Mr. McNARY. No.

Mr. BROOKHART. Is \$250,000,000 enough? I say it is not. There is plenty of evidence to prove it is not enough to handle the proposition. It took \$500,000,000 to handle wheat alone during the war. I have on my desk now Mr. Hoover's report of the amount of capital used. It will not take more than one-third that much for wheat in peace times, but on that basis it would take \$500,000,000 to properly handle cotton in peace times.

How would the cotton proposition be handled? According to the provisions of my proposed substitute, the Department of Agriculture will ascertain, as it does now, the average cost of production of cotton for five years. I have provided some additional rules that they shall follow in their figuring of the cost of production. Their present methods are not adequate because, first, they allow no adequate compensation to the farmer for his work. They take simply the prices given him, which are very small indeed. Second, they allow no depreciation of his soil and they allow no depreciation of his buildings, of his work animals, and his breeding animals. By my bill I would provide that they should allow those elements in fixing the cost of production and shall allow him a capital return of only 5 per cent.

Let us suppose we had had this \$500,000,000 and had gone out to buy the big surplus of cotton two years ago. We would have bid directly to the farmers themselves that cost of production and capital return price. That would have taken up the surplus and would have raised the domestic price to that level, 24 or 26 cents, or whatever it might figure out. We would have left on hand in the corporation that surplus to be disposed of in the world market.

But the Senator from Idaho [Mr. GOODING] has said that we are producing 65 per cent of the world's cotton. I think we are exporting something over 60 per cent of the exportable cotton of the world. Having this cotton on hand in the hands of a single agency, what would be the situation? There are about 50 agencies now exporting cotton, competing with each other in selling cotton in the world market, naturally beating down the price of cotton, which is the effect competition has on the selling side of cotton. But here is one agency, and it is financed how? It is like Mr. Ford in that it is its own banker. It does not have to borrow any money and it does not have to sell to pay any back. It then says to the world, "The cost of producing this cotton was so much, and we want a 5 per cent capital return."

The world will pay it. I agree with the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. SMITH] in his statement on yesterday that there would be no dollar of loss on cotton if it were handled in that way in the United States. There would be no equalization fee required to take that up. The Senator from South Carolina thought that cotton stood alone in this regard.

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President—

Mr. BROOKHART. I yield to the Senator from Idaho.

Mr. BORAH. As I understand the Senator's proposition, it is to hold the cotton which we are going to control until the price represents 5 per cent upon the investment?

Mr. BROOKHART. That is substantially the situation.

Mr. BORAH. I am interested to know how we would determine the amount of investment in producing the entire cotton crop.

Mr. BROOKHART. I have provided in my substitute bill that the Department of Agriculture shall determine the average cost of production for the preceding five-year period. I do not want it based on any one seasonal situation, because the seasons vary so much, but a five-year average is a good basis. They are doing that now, but they are not allowing the farmer any greater compensation than his price gets him, which since 1920 has been considerably less than \$700 a year for the work of himself and his family. I have provided in the bill that they shall figure in enough additional to give him a reasonable compensation for his work and his management of the farm. I think no one will dispute that right. They have not

allowed a depletion of the soil which occurs. They have not allowed depreciation of the buildings, fences, breeding animals, and work animals on the farm, and that occurs.

I have directed in my substitute bill that the Department of Agriculture add in these elements and determine from them the average cost of production. They take from the census figures the capital investment. That is not Government price fixing. That is price fixing by the facts of the situation. Then this institution, which I have authorized from Government funds up to \$1,500,000,000, goes and bids to the farmer that average price, making due allowance, of course, for the difference in freight charges to the world market at Liverpool, exactly as was done in that proposition by the Grain Corporation during the war. That being bid to the farmer, everybody knows it will benefit the farmer. It will not benefit cotton exchanges or any other middleman anywhere else. It will benefit the cotton farmer.

Since 60 per cent of the cotton which the world buys comes from the United States, there is no place else to get it. Unless that price is made unreasonable, they will pay this cost of production and 5 per cent return, and we need to have no dollar of loss, no equalization fee, nor anything else in it to make up losses in that operation.

The Senator from South Carolina [Mr. SMITH] said that cotton stood alone in this regard, and I want to comment briefly on that suggestion. Cotton does not stand alone. Let us take wheat and get the size of the wheat proposition. There is not much difference. I have only the figures for five years, 1918 to 1923, the latest I could get. The United States furnished 36 per cent of the exportable wheat of the world during the average of those five years, and Canada furnished enough more to make 55 per cent of all the exportable wheat of the world.

Mr. BORAH. That was since the war?

Mr. BROOKHART. Yes; since the war.

Mr. BORAH. Prior to the war we were shipping abroad only about 90,000,000 bushels of wheat a year.

Mr. BROOKHART. The amount of exportable wheat of the world is not so very great. In those days it was something like 225,000,000 bushels, as I recollect. I can give the Senator the exact figures if he desires them.

Mr. BORAH. What I was thinking about was that when we come back to the conditions which prevailed prior to the war with reference to production in foreign countries, we will not be exporting 200,000,000 bushels of wheat, as we are now.

Mr. BROOKHART. That is true. The point I was bringing out, in order to make a comparison of wheat with cotton, was that the United States and Canada together are furnishing 55 per cent of the exportable wheat of the world. That is more than half of all the wheat that all the countries export. Argentina, Australia, New Zealand, Russia, and all of them together only export about 45 per cent. The United States and Canada export 55 per cent.

Canada has already organized a very efficient wheat pool and, as I have said, if we study the world market of wheat before and since that pool, even the small percentage that Canada has been able to handle by withholding and not dumping in the world market at unseasonable times, has actually stabilized and improved the world market for wheat. As soon as we are in condition in the United States to join with Canada in that pool, and it is to our interest to cooperate in it, the two of us together can have as much influence and naturally will have as much influence on the world market for wheat as the United States alone could for cotton, and could have complete control of the world market for both wheat and cotton within reasonable limits.

I am not able at this time to give the exact figures and percentages of the other farm crops. Cotton and wheat are the two largest export items, the two big propositions on which we might have a loss in the operation of this surplus corporation, but there should be no loss as we have seen.

Livestock products and pork products come next, and then the others are smaller on down the line.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BROOKHART. Certainly.

Mr. KING. I would like to ask the Senator what machinery is set up under the provisions of his bill to prevent the increased production of those commodities taken over by the Government? It would seem to me that if we start out with the premise—and that seems to be the principal characteristic of the Senator's bill—that there must be a 5 per cent return upon the capital invested by the farmer; and if it be true that they are not making, as the Senator contends, anywhere near that amount now upon their investment, there will be a great encouragement in agriculture. There will be a large increase in exports

in these agricultural products. How are we going to restrain production?

The bill offered by the Senator from Oregon [Mr. McNARY] has a provision by which that is largely limited, but if I understand the Senator from Iowa, and I am asking for information, his scheme does not contemplate a restriction in production. It seems to me that if we guarantee a return upon the capital investment, and that means, of course, allowing the farmer and those who work with him a reasonable wage, there would be a great encouragement for increased agricultural production and, therefore, a large exportable product. How does the Senator deal with that question?

Mr. BROOKHART. The Senator has asked another very vital question. I think oftener than any other we have heard the argument that a plan of this kind would stimulate overproduction. I believe even the President in his veto message said that in the end it would damage the farmers because of the overproduction. Again I want to get the facts surrounding the question of production, and when we get them I think it will show that overproduction would be the least of our troubles and the least of our dangers. So far as the provision in the bill of the Senator from Oregon is concerned as it relates to production, it simply provides that the board, when it finds farmers producing too much, can stop operations. They will never find it, so far as that is concerned.

But there is no danger of overproduction. I will say to the Senator from Utah that if we applied this bill of mine to wheat alone or to cotton alone or to livestock products alone there would be, while it was applied to wheat, an overproduction of wheat, while it was applied to cotton there would be an overproduction of cotton, and while it was applied to livestock there would be an overproduction of livestock, because wheat growers would quit wheat and go over to cotton, they would quit livestock and go over to cotton or over to wheat, one from the other. That is what happened to some extent as a result of the stimulated price of wheat during the war. But if we take care of all these products on the same basis, then they will go ahead exactly as they are now; there will be no advantage in changing from wheat to corn or to oats or to cotton or to livestock or to any other product, because the same protection, the same situation will apply to all. The only overproduction then will be a general overproduction, if it shall occur.

Now, I wish to read a statement as to the facts surrounding production, and I take them from the National Industrial Conference Board report. To begin with, that board is certainly not a farmer's board. I will give it credit, however, for making a fair statement of facts, even if it never has suggested any remedy for the facts it has discovered. On page 78 of its report of 1926—

Mr. KING. Is that the Nagel report?

Mr. BROOKHART. It is the National Industrial Conference Board report. Mr. Nagel represented this board in conjunction with the United States Chamber of Commerce in a report on this subject, but for some mysterious reason or other he forgot the facts this board had dug up and found in its original report, although those facts were just as true then as they now are. They have been true all the time. I now proceed to read them:

These considerations are emphasized in the case of the United States. The increase in agricultural production during the war period and the "surplus" in the postwar years were in large part only apparent. The marked growth of cereal exports during the decade 1913-1922 was not the result of a sudden expansion of the per capita area of land in crops. From 1900 to 1925 the trend of crop acreage per capita was downward, and in the period 1919-1922 the per capita acreage in 12 principal crops was 10 per cent less than for the period 1899-1903.

The "surplus," which has in large part been the source of agricultural depression since the war, was partly the result of an increase in the acreage of cereals, especially wheat, at the expense of other crops, and partly due to the falling off in domestic demand in 1920-1922. The average in the five cereals in 1919-1922 exceeded that of the pre-war period, 1909-1913, by about 23,000,000 acres, of which wheat accounted for more than 18,000,000 acres. This increased acreage was made possible by a reduction in that used in producing for domestic uses, especially for feeding livestock. From the pre-war period, 1909-1913 to 1919-1922, the per capita acreage employed in producing for domestic consumption declined nearly 6 per cent.

Most of the acreage thus economized was diverted to increasing the production of wheat under the stimulus of high prices and of patriotic appeal during the war period. But even during that time the per capita production of the major crops taken together was not markedly higher than pre-war. The average for the five-year period 1915-1919 was 0.4 per cent lower, and that for 1920-1924 was 4.8 per cent lower

than the average of the pre-war period 1910-1913. The apparent surplus was due partly to the shifting of the balance of production and partly, as will be seen later, to the decline of effective domestic and foreign demand in 1920-1922.

The acreage in wheat, however, has been rapidly returning to normal. Although in 1923 it was still 27 per cent larger than the average of the five years before the war, and in 1924-25 it was about 11 per cent higher than pre-war, in view of the population increase in the past decade, this indicates a definite tendency toward readjustment of supply and demand.

This readjustment, however, has been accompanied by disturbance and distress which illustrate both the importance and difficulty of control of production.

That is why the bill of a year ago would have been a very bad thing, because it included only a part of the farm products. These bills include them all, and the readjustment or shifting back and forth of production will not occur under them.

After new land, some of it range, was broken up and put into wheat, houses built, livestock and implements purchased, and debts incurred, it was not easy to let the land go back to pasture or to shift it to other uses.

I saw some very pitiable conditions of that kind in Wyoming and other Western States.

In large areas of the Northwest the process has simply meant abandonment of land and equipment. Moreover, as has already been pointed out, the transference of a relatively small proportion of the acreage in one of the major crops to a minor crop is likely to result in overproduction of the latter, while the output of the farmer is relatively little affected. The subtraction of 10,000,000 acres from the corn area, for instance, and its transfer to potatoes or other small crops, might easily double the production of some of these. Thus, even though the total acreage in crops is kept under control, the shifting of acreage as between the various branches of production under the influence of price changes may upset the equilibrium of agricultural income.

One of the greatest evils of all is the presence of conditions that do upset that equilibrium.

All evidence points to the fact that the apparent surplus of cereal products, due to reduction in the per capita acreage of land employed for producing livestock for domestic consumption, and to the overexpansion in the per capita acreage of wheat and rye at the expense of other crops, has merely obscured temporarily the increasing scarcity of land in the United States in relation to domestic demand. Under the gradual operation of economic forces some degree of adjustment of production, at least in respect to acreage put into the major crops, has undoubtedly taken place in the United States. Data given in the preceding chapter show that the acreage in farms in proportion to total population—

And I especially invite the attention of the Senate to these figures—

has declined almost steadily since 1860 from 13 acres per capita to 9 in 1920. The per capita acreage of improved land has declined steadily since 1890 and is now about the same it was in 1850. The per capita acreage of land in crops has declined since 1900 and is now below the point at which it was in 1880. These declines in acreage were offset up to about 1900 by an increase in yield per acre of the nine principal crops, but since that time the yield per acre has shown no increase, and in consequence the per capita production of the principal crops, as charts 3 and 4 indicate, has shown a tendency to decline almost steadily since 1900. The number of livestock per capita has declined to about 30 per cent since 1893. The wheat acreage has undergone a great reduction since 1920.

In general, therefore, as to the outlook in respect to production in the United States there appears to be progressively less likelihood of overexpansion in the future than there has been in the past. Practically all the readily available land for crop production and pasture is now in use. Extensions of acreage are likely to be largely at the expense of pasture and otherwise only at increasing cost. As has been seen in comparison with other lines of activity, agriculture by and large is not so profitable under normal condition that there is any great incentive to extend the margin of cultivation, extensively or intensively, much beyond the requirements to be determined by demand. The average farmer and his family under present conditions are working so hard, and the overhead charges for interest and taxes are so high, that stabilization or even moderate increases in prices would hardly be likely to stimulate any considerable general overexpansion of acreage or production.

I think that is the best statement of facts that has ever been promulgated upon the question of production, and I think the facts are indisputable.

Mr. President, the new McNary-Haugen bill is different from the old McNary-Haugen bill, the one with which I first became acquainted. That first bill provided an appropriation of \$200,000,000 and a thousand million dollars additional by bond issues

to handle the exportable surplus. That was the McNary-Haugen bill that I learned to love and that the farmers learned to love. But now, where has that \$1,200,000,000 of Government capital gone? It has been pared down to \$250,000,000 with which to handle a \$2,000,000,000 a year exportable surplus. It can not be done.

The Senator from Oregon in his explanation says we will start out by lending the \$250,000,000 to cooperatives. I wish to review the history of loans to cooperatives. We established a War Finance Corporation which was to lend money to cooperatives. I talked to-day with Mr. Meyer, who managed that corporation, and he told me that there was no limitation on the amount that could be loaned, that the War Finance Corporation could have loaned all the cooperatives asked for, that it did loan in one year about \$120,000,000, and the amount loaned could just as well have gone to a billion if the cooperatives had been organized and had asked for the loans. That project failed. What effect did the lending of money through the War Finance Corporation have upon the agricultural situation? What did it do to the farmers who were losing their homes? It sent them right on into bankruptcy; it did not succeed.

Then there was devised another money-lending plan. We created the intermediate credit-bank system. Under that system, already established, Mr. Meyer also pointed out to me to-day that we can lend the farmers \$600,000,000. So this thing of lending money to cooperatives has failed twice and failed when it had a wider margin and a bigger backing. Now it is proposed to have it succeed with a paltry \$250,000,000 behind a \$2,000,000,000-a-year surplus crop.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BROOKHART. I yield.

Mr. KING. I hope I understand the Senator correctly; and if I do so understand him, it is his view that progressively the production for export will decrease. He read a statement to that effect from a book and pronounced the statement one of the soundest that has been promulgated, and stated that he indorsed it. If the amount produced for export is to be progressively less, then why will not the amount provided in the McNary-Haugen bill be sufficient? Why would it not be adequate if the Senator's bill, which provides nothing, as I understand, directly for the handling of exportable surplus, meets the situation?

Mr. BROOKHART. The Senator has not read my bill; he has not stated its provisions correctly. My bill provides fifteen hundred million dollars directly for handling the surplus crops.

Mr. KING. By the issuance of bonds?

Mr. BROOKHART. Yes.

Mr. KING. But the original appropriation—

Mr. BROOKHART. The original appropriation is only \$250,000,000. It is the purpose of the bill to employ the additional money only as it may be needed. I do not want it appropriated at one time. I want to follow the original McNary-Haugen idea, and so my bill provides a sum only a little bit greater than that bill provided in the beginning. In my bill I have increased the amount which would be available, while the proponents of the old McNary-Haugen bill have decreased the amount.

Mr. KING. But if the organization that is to be created, whether under the Senator's bill or under McNary-Haugen bill, is to handle only the surplus, and the surplus is to be progressively less and less each year, it does seem to me that the amount required to handle that surplus would not be as great as contended by the Senator and would be met by the provisions of the McNary-Haugen bill.

Mr. BROOKHART. The trouble with that proposition is that in spite of all this declining that I have read to you, the surplus still remains about \$2,000,000,000 a year. It runs, I think, from \$1,800,000,000 to about \$2,200,000,000. We will have to start with the proposition of handling a \$2,000,000,000 surplus on an average, and it will decline in the next 10 or 20 years, and perhaps by the end of 30 years it will be gone and we will have no surplus problem; but 30 years is a long time to stay in bankruptcy.

Mr. President, I want to congratulate the Senator from Oregon on the fairness with which he has presented his bill. He made no extravagant claims. He admitted that this money-lending proposition, which has already failed twice, might not succeed.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. McMASTER in the chair). Does the Senator from Iowa yield to the Senator from Minnesota?

Mr. BROOKHART. I yield.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. In regard to this loaning of money to cooperatives, the intermediate credit banks were organized for the purpose of loaning money to farm cooperatives and farmers through banks, all owned by the Federal farm land bank.

Mr. BROOKHART. Yes.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. A great deal of money was loaned, and now I—and I take it for granted other Senators—are being solicited to support a proposition to relieve these banks of their liability for guaranteeing to the Federal land bank the principal of the money advanced by the Federal land bank to these country banks to loan to farmers. This paper is now frozen paper. I am informed by people who write to me, and unless the Federal land bank assumes the liability or the Federal Government assumes the liability the banks that hold this paper will have to be closed. The various State departments of banking will close the State banks, which are loaded up with this frozen paper originally covered by loans through the intermediate credit-bank system. Now, as a matter of fact, if the liability of the local bank is removed by legislation, some one else will have to pay. Either the stockholders of the Federal land bank will have to pay or the Federal Government will have to appropriate money to reimburse the land bank for the money that is lost in these loans. That will be a form of subsidy.

I wanted to call that to the Senator's attention.

Mr. BROOKHART. I think the Senator is right on that; and I also think that this argument that the McNary bill is not a subsidy and that my substitute is a subsidy is without foundation. The McNary bill itself is a subsidy. It is based on a subsidy principle, because \$250,000,000 of Government money is handed over for use. That revolving fund, so far as its use is concerned, is a subsidy and it is on the subsidy principle.

I am not frightened, however, by this subsidy argument. We have had some experience with subsidies in the United States before. This is not the first time that we have had talks of subsidy. I remember a railroad bill in 1920—the transportation act. There are a number of Senators here who voted for that bill. That bill provided that for the first six months we should guarantee out of the Treasury of the United States the operating expenses and the war-time return, as the railroads had received that return during Government operation. Yesterday I asked the Interstate Commerce Commission for the figures as to how much subsidy we had paid to the railroads on that guaranty, and I have it here. It is \$529,278,911.51, and we still owe them \$250,000.

By the terms of the transportation act we went into the Treasury of the United States and paid that subsidy to the railroads to guarantee the war-time profits of those roads the first six months after they were turned back. We not only did that but in order to make sure that there would be a deficit under that guaranty those roads increased their operating expenses the first year after we turned them back by \$1,485,000,000, nearly a billion and a half of dollars. They only claim \$600,000,000 of that to be increase in wages, and the other is increase for reasons that I can not state this afternoon; and because of that situation we paid this subsidy.

I listened to the Senator from Indiana [Mr. Watson] saying that this bill of the Senator from Oregon is not a subsidy, and that he is opposed to subsidies; but the Senator from Indiana was the principal promoter and supporter of this railroad bill that paid more than half a billion dollars of subsidy to the railroads of the United States. He had no scruples against subsidies when it came to the railroads.

Some one says, "But the Government took over the railroads, and it did not take over the farms." The Government did take over the wheat, however; and the Government surrounded cotton and all of the other staple products with such conditions of price fixing that it virtually fixed the price and took over all of the farm products during the war. I think no one will dispute that. I have here Mr. Hoover's report on the operations of the wheat corporation during the war. I just got that yesterday, fresh up to date. In the Government operation of this wheat corporation they had a profit of \$59,000,000, and that is safely tucked away in the Treasury of the United States. So it is wrong, it would appear, to pay subsidies to the farmers; the Government must collect profits from them; but it is all right for the Government to pay subsidies to the railroads, because they are controlled by the big Wall Street financial crowd.

As a measure of comparative justice, at least, I have provided in my substitute that the Government shall pay the losses of this export corporation up to \$600,000,000. That is just a little over the sum total of what the Government did for the railroads and took from the farmers.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Iowa yield to the Senator from Utah?

Mr. BROOKHART. I yield.

Mr. KING. Does the Senator anticipate that there will be a loss of \$600,000,000 under his bill which will be a charge upon the Treasury of the United States?

Mr. BROOKHART. Not in any one year. I do not anticipate a loss of \$100,000,000 in any one year.

Mr. KING. Is that loss to be indefinite; that is to say, are we to have an annual deficit, which is to be met by resort to the Treasury of the United States?

Mr. BROOKHART. It stops when the \$600,000,000 is reached. If it takes 10 years to reach that amount, it will take 10 years to reach the stopping point.

Mr. KING. Having reached the momentum which it will reach in 10 years and the absorption of \$600,000,000 of loss, does the Senator think we will be able to resist that momentum and stop the subsidy from being continued indefinitely?

Mr. BROOKHART. I assume that we will be able to do our duty, whatever it is.

Mr. KING. If it is our duty to pay \$100,000,000 a year deficit now for 10 years, will not the duty be increasingly greater after that period, because the people will have been accustomed to it, and we will have encouraged them to believe that they are going to get that subsidy every year?

Mr. BROOKHART. We have found that this surplus is declining every year, and perhaps in 10 years it will be reduced until the loss will be small. The senior Senator from Utah [Mr. Smoot] has indicated to me that there need be no loss in the operation of this corporation if it is properly financed and properly managed, which it ought to be.

However, I will not stop there. I want to make this comparison complete.

We gave \$500,000,000 to the railroads. There are only one-seventh as many people interested in the railroads as there are in the farms; and, valued as the farms are, there is considerably less than one-third as much capital in the railroads as there is in the farms. If we would do proportionately as much for agriculture as we have done for the railroads since they were turned back in 1920 we would pay \$3,000,000,000 out of the Treasury of the United States, and I know that would run this export surplus corporation until we had no surplus.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Iowa yield to the Senator from Kentucky?

Mr. BROOKHART. I yield.

Mr. BARKLEY. Without attempting to draw invidious comparisons between the railroads and agriculture, because I think whatever duty the Government owes to either should be performed impartially, is it not true that in the last six years it has been estimated that the loss in the value of property by the farmers of the country and the loss in the value of their products has amounted to more than the estimated value of all the railroads in the United States?

Mr. BROOKHART. I think the Senator is correct. The Manufacturers Record puts the total farm deflation at \$32,000,000,000, and that is about as much as the railroads even claim in value. It puts the loss of other business at \$18,000,000,000. That is the Manufacturers Record, a high authority and a fair authority, I think. That means that the farmers are deflated about six times as much in proportion as the other business of the country; and the deflation of that \$18,000,000,000 was on little business and not on big business. The deflation was also timed so as to hit agriculture in October, when the crops were matured, when the whole year's crop was ready for market; and therefore it hit agriculture harder than it did the other lines of business.

Mr. President, without going into the details of the working out of these two bills—I do not care so much about that; I will not debate about details, except to get them efficient—I think I have stated the big propositions that are at issue.

First, the McNary bill is wholly inadequate. Two hundred and fifty million dollars will not under any conditions handle this proposition, and it is worse than useless to go out to finance this surplus with an inadequate supply of funds. We will be defeated, and it will be lost as surely as we try it. In the next place, if that is not enough, we will try that out and squander that \$250,000,000, and then we will go to an equalization fee. I want to ask the Senators from the South how their cotton farmers will be able to pay an equalization fee before their price is raised. This lending did not raise the price before, and it will not do it again, and they are not going into this equali-

zation fee until after the \$250,000,000 is used up in lending to cooperatives. Then they come along the first thing with an equalization fee, and the farmer does not then know what price he will get for his cotton. I say it is unsafe and unsound. It is just as unsafe and unsound for the wheat farmers of the North.

If we are going to handle this proposition, I want to handle it as any business man would handle it if it were his single proposition. The United States is the big farm of this Congress. This big \$2,000,000,000-a-year surplus is the big surplus the Congress should handle, and since it has given this advantage to the railroads by law, by enactment of Congress; since it has given an advantage to every protected manufacturer in the United States by law, by tariff enactment; since it has given an advantage to the banking industry of the United States by creating a governmental reserve bank, controlled and operated by the Government, a board appointed by the President and confirmed by the Senate; since it protects the patented industries of the United States by law; since it fixes the value of every public utility by law, and fixes a return of at least 7 per cent, and that when the American people are producing only 5½ per cent; I say, since the Government has done these things for all these industries, it owes it to agriculture to go into the Treasury of the United States for that whole three thousand million dollars to make right the wrongs it has done.

Mr. PHIPPS. Mr. President, I would like to inquire of the Senator from Oregon if it is proposed to continue debate on the pending measure this afternoon. Are any other Senators ready to speak?

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, I shall very gladly yield to the Senator from Colorado, the unfinished business being temporarily laid aside for the consideration of the District appropriation bill.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Colorado yield to the Senator from Georgia?

Mr. PHIPPS. I yield.

FATE OF POSTMASTER AT DOUGLAS, GA.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, I send to the desk an article appearing in this morning's Washington Post, and ask that it be read by the clerk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will read.

The Chief Clerk read as follows:

POSTMASTER LAID DEATH TO FORCED G. O. P. GIFTS—HAD TO PAY \$2,000 TO KEEP JOB, SUICIDE'S LETTER DECLARES—COMMITTEEMAN IS NAMED

DOUGLAS, GA., April 2.—Charges that the Republican Party exacted donations from him that had driven him into debt and that "they are still claiming more" were made by L. S. Peterson, Democratic postmaster here for more than 12 years, in a letter written shortly before he shot and killed one of his clerks and committed suicide yesterday. The shooting took place just after Peterson had been relieved of the post by a recently appointed successor.

Peterson, who received an annual salary of \$2,700, said that these contributions amounted to more than \$2,000 over five years and indicated they had been demanded in return for patronage under which he was permitted to retain his position.

His letter, addressed to his brother, J. H. Peterson and read at the coroner's inquest, also charged he had been "framed" by two employees of the post office, one of whom, J. E. Kirkland, was his victim.

"The Republican Party has pulled me for over \$2,000 in the last five years," he wrote, "and they are still claiming more now. Thomas W. Overstreet, the inspector, and Elton Kirkland, money-order clerk, are to blame for it all. They have framed me. These donations are responsible for my financial condition. What they have taken away from me is why I am in debt to-day."

Authorities made public a letter found in Peterson's pocket, in which he was directed to send money to R. H. Johnson, postmaster at Ocilla, Ga., to be sent in turn to Ben J. Davis, negro Republican national committeeman for Georgia in Atlanta. It was dated September 27, 1927, but bore no signature.

Peterson, who was first appointed by President Wilson, did not elaborate on his charges against Kirkland and Overstreet. Friends said he and the former had been in disagreement for some time.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, other than the press report, the details in this case I do not know. I do know that some few days ago a shortage was reported by a post-office inspector in the Douglas, Ga., office. The shortage was alleged to be \$214, I believe, to be exact. The Postmaster General issued an order removing Mr. Peterson, and I am not disposed at all to criticize the Postmaster General. I talked with him, and in the circumstances he was quite within the discharge of his duty in issuing the order of removal and in the appoint-

ment of an acting postmaster. It is not about that matter that I wish to speak.

Mr. Peterson was an honorable man, and held office during three separate administrations. He was personally known to me. I am prepared to accept the statement made by him, and contained in a letter to his brother, referred to in this press dispatch. But beyond that, it is known in my State, and has been known for several years, that the Federal employees not only are required to make contributions, under the guise of campaign contributions, in order to obtain Federal office, but that month by month and year by year during their continuance in office they are compelled to continue those contributions.

In this particular case Mr. Peterson says that over the five-year period last past he has contributed a total of \$2,000 to the Republican organization in Georgia, though his salary as postmaster was but \$2,700 a year.

My colleague the senior Senator from Georgia [Mr. HARRIS] and myself many months ago specifically directed the attention of the Postmaster General and of the Attorney General to conditions which were undoubtedly known to exist in my State. There was an investigation, through the regular channels, by these two departments of the Government, but beyond deterring for the time being those responsible for this condition of affairs, nothing came of it.

Incidents like this bring very forcibly to the attention of the country and to the Senate of the United States conditions that exist at least in certain of the Southern States.

Mr. BRUCE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. GEORGE. I yield.

Mr. BRUCE. Was this man a third-class postmaster?

Mr. GEORGE. I am not sure whether the office is second or third class. It is on the border line between third and second class; I think it is second class.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. GEORGE. I yield.

Mr. BARKLEY. Were these contributions made during the postmaster-generalship of Mr. Will Hays?

Mr. GEORGE. I was not then in the Senate, and I am not familiar with what went on then.

Mr. BARKLEY. If it turns out that that was true, in view of the fact that he seemed to have had an elastic supply from another source, does not the Senator think he ought to have let this poor fellow off?

Mr. GEORGE. This particular postmaster, I will say to the Senator, held office during the administration of former Postmaster General Will Hays.

Mr. BRUCE. Mr. President, I will say that we have at the present time pending in the Senate a bill to subject fourth-class postmasters to competitive examination. The idea of that bill is to place them within the classified service.

Mr. GEORGE. Yes; I am familiar with that.

Mr. BRUCE. A very fair test as to how successful the Senator will be in arousing indignation in the Senate against the abuse he has mentioned would be the extent to which Senators may be disposed to vote for legislation of that kind.

Mr. GEORGE. I fully agree with the Senator's observation.

Mr. President, this condition is not a new one. It has been brought to the attention of the Senate many times before, but it is a condition that should not exist in the United States. It is a sad commentary upon free institutions when important public offices are thus peddled about, and when the very tenure of office itself is dependent upon continuous and enforced contributions to a State committee, a party committee, whether that party committee be Democratic or Republican or what not.

It is, of course, most difficult to prove the exact state of affairs existing in any particular State at any particular time with reference to Federal patronage. But incidents of this kind serve to confirm what all informed men and women within the State believe to be true, and serve to confirm the conviction that public offices are, in effect, sold and that many are compelled to make contributions after they get in office in order to retain office.

Some time ago I was at pains to find out exactly the number of postal employees in my State who had been reported short in their accounts. The percentage was alarming, and the condition is due to but one fact and that is the exaction made of the appointee before or at the time of appointment, and the continuous exaction thereafter as long as the appointee remains in office. The matter is of tremendous importance. It is vastly more important than much legislation which we consider here on the floor of the Senate, because it involves the very integrity of our Federal system within the States, certainly in the South, so far as I am informed.

Mr. President, my colleague and myself have again renewed our request for and will insist upon a thorough investigation by the Post Office Department and the Department of Justice. We would like to proceed in the regular and orderly way because the Government ought to be able to rid itself of these reprehensible and disgraceful practices and conditions. But if we can not obtain through those channels results to which we are entitled, we shall certainly come to the Senate and ask for a most searching investigation by some committee of the Senate.

Whether the money goes to any political party, whether all of it actually reaches the hands of the Republican committee in the State, or whether all of it actually reaches the hands of any particular Republican Party official in the State, if the sum of the exactions made of Federal officeholders in my State alone was known that total would be fairly staggering to all decent men and women in the country.

Mr. BRUCE. Mr. President, may I ask the Senator whether I am correct in thinking that it is a criminal offense for one Federal officeholder to collect money for political purposes from another? My recollection is that the civil service laws make it so. Of course, it is not so easy to discover such a fact.

Mr. GEORGE. It is a criminal offense, as I understand, for anyone, Federal officeholder or not, to demand of a Federal officer in or about his place of business the payment of money for campaign purposes or for other purposes political. Partly as the result of an investigation which was carried on upon the demands of my colleague and myself some two or three years ago, an additional statute was enacted which requires an appointee to a Federal office, before taking office, to make affidavit that he has not paid any money to procure the indorsement of any person or for the appointment itself. But the Senator realizes how difficult it is to find the facts and submit them to the department in each case.

Mr. BRUCE. We would have to have the investigation the Senator mentions in order to get at those facts.

Mr. GEORGE. Of course, the Senator realizes that a Senator can not himself occupy the position of a private detective. If he should undertake it his entire time would be consumed in that process.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. President, I merely wish to say that I agree with all that my colleague has said about the sale of Federal offices in Georgia. From my knowledge of conditions I would say that instead of this case being an exception it is the rule. Ninety per cent of the post-office appointments, I believe, are sold in my State, and I do not believe the money ever goes to the Republican National Committee. I know something about expenditures of the men in charge who handle the money, and I feel sure that they are handling it for their own personal use.

My colleague and I, as he stated, for several years have brought this condition to the attention of the Attorney General and the Postmaster General. I have the very highest regard for the Postmaster General, as all of us have who were associated with him here in the Senate. I wish he would go into the matter as well as the Attorney General, whom we are both asking now to investigate the conditions which are just as bad as they can be. Such conditions are a disgrace to the Republican Party, but the negro national committeeman who controls these appointments cares nothing about that.

As my colleague stated, I introduced a resolution a year and a half ago to investigate the sale of offices down there. The charges can be proven without any doubt, but the investigation was held up in the Judiciary Committee because of the opposition of former Senator Ernst, of Kentucky, who was then a member of that committee. Something must be done to prevent such methods being used in these appointments and my colleague and I will leave nothing undone in remedying matters.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA APPROPRIATIONS

Mr. PHIPPS. Mr. President, I ask that the pending unfinished business be temporarily laid aside and that the Senate proceed to the consideration of House bill 11133, making appropriations for the government of the District of Columbia and other activities chargeable in whole or in part against the revenues of such District for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1929, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to laying temporarily aside the unfinished business? The Chair hears none.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, I would like to inquire of the Senator if he will be willing, in the event the bill, other than the item of which I am about to refer, shall have been concluded before the usual time for adjournment, to postpone until tomorrow the consideration of the 60-40 provision. There are a number of Senators absent.

Mr. PHIPPS. Mr. President, I would be quite willing to do so. I feel that, perhaps, it would be the proper procedure, in view of the fact that there are many Senators absent to-day. Yet it is desired to go ahead in the regular manner with the ordinary provisions of the bill, and this appeared to have been a rather favorable time to get the bill up for consideration.

Mr. KING. I share the views of my friend from Colorado, and am very glad to join with him in asking that we proceed with the consideration of the bill, other than the item to which I have referred; but if we shall conclude all the other items in the bill by 4 o'clock or half past 4, I shall ask that the consideration of that item go over until to-morrow.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the bill which had been reported from the Committee on Appropriations with amendments.

Mr. PHIPPS. I ask that the formal reading of the bill be dispensed with, that the bill be read for amendment, and that the committee amendments be first considered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

The Chief Clerk proceeded to read the bill.

The first amendment of the Committee on Appropriations was, on page 1, after line 2, to strike out "That in order to defray the expenses of the District of Columbia for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1929, any revenue—not including the proportionate share of the United States in any revenue arising as the result of the expenditure of appropriations made for the fiscal year 1924 and prior fiscal years—now required by law to be credited to the District of Columbia and the United States in the same proportion that each contributed to the activity or source from whence such revenue was derived shall be credited wholly to the District of Columbia, and, in addition, \$9,000,000 is appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to be advanced July 1, 1928, and all the remainder out of the combined revenues of the District of Columbia and such advances from the Federal Treasury as are authorized in the District of Columbia appropriation act for the fiscal year 1923, namely," and in lieu thereof to insert:

That in order to defray the expenses of the District of Columbia for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1929, 40 per cent of each of the following sums, except those herein directed to be paid otherwise, is appropriated out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, and all the remainder out of the combined revenues of the District of Columbia, and the tax rate in effect in the fiscal year 1928 on real estate and tangible personal property subject to taxation in the District of Columbia shall be continued for the fiscal year 1929, namely:

Mr. PHIPPS. Mr. President, that is the matter which it has been suggested shall go over for consideration to-morrow.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment will be passed over, without objection.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "License bureau," on page 5, line 5, after the name "District of Columbia," to strike out "without paying the license tax named in paragraph 32, section 7, of the District of Columbia appropriation act approved July 1, 1902, subject to the proviso contained in said paragraph," so as to read:

For personal services in accordance with the classification act of 1923, \$17,820; temporary clerk hire, \$1,500; in all, \$19,320: *Provided*, That hereafter no person shall practice phrenology in the District of Columbia.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Office of corporation counsel," on page 5, line 24, after the figures "1923," to strike out "\$50,840" and insert "\$53,420"; and in the same line, after the words "in all," to strike out "\$58,340" and insert "\$60,920," so as to read:

Corporation counsel, including extra compensation as general counsel of the Public Utilities Commission, \$7,500, and other personal services in accordance with the classification act of 1923, \$53,420; in all, \$60,920.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, I should like to inquire of the Senator in charge of the bill the reason for the increase in this item.

Mr. PHIPPS. Mr. President, there has been a transfer from this department to another department which gives an increase on the face of the item, but it is compensated for by the displacement of three policemen, as will be seen when we come to another section of the bill. It means a better organization and a better allocation of the duties, and in cases where work is

now being done by three policemen it will hereafter be performed by three civilian clerks at lower rates of pay.

Mr. KING. I hope I have not in view the item that the Senator does. I was calling attention to the item relating to the corporation counsel's office and am now wondering what policemen would have to do with that office.

Mr. PHIPPS. This item comes under the head of "Information department and stenographic service."

Mr. KING. In the corporation counsel's office?

Mr. PHIPPS. Yes; that is correct.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Office of superintendent of weights, measures, and markets," on page 6, line 15, after the figures "1923," to strike out "\$41,045" and insert "\$43,685," so as to read:

For personal services in accordance with the classification act of 1923, \$45,685.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 6, line 19, to increase the appropriation for maintenance and repairs to markets from \$6,000 to \$7,500.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 6, after line 19, to insert:

For repairs, alterations, additions, and purchase and installation of equipment, Western Market, \$50,000.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, with respect to the item just stated, and items on pages 20 and 21, I would like to ask the Senator to make an explanation in view of the fact that the District of Columbia Committee two or three days ago recommended, as I recall, a bill carrying an appropriation of \$35,000 for sheds and for a temporary market. Do they relate to the same thing?

Mr. PHIPPS. No; that related to the produce market, which item would not be properly taken into this bill. That is an authorization which has not yet reached the stage of the Budget estimate. However, the items we are caring for in this item are those relating to the Western Market in the neighborhood of F and Twentieth Streets. The roof is absolutely gone beyond repair, the brick walls need pointing up, and the refrigerators are in a disgraceful condition. They need a proper refrigerating system there. The market should be maintained. We have added \$1,500 in one item and \$50,000 to provide a new iron roof and a refrigerating system.

The market has been a little more than self-supporting, and with the installation of modern refrigerators the rentals or receipts from those having their use will be increased so that it will prove a real investment.

Mr. KING. I would like to ask the Senator whether, in view of the fact that we have an acute controversy here with reference to the southwest and the mid-city or Patterson tract for the location of the market, the ground for which may cost from \$300,000 to \$600,000, and perhaps more, for the building, the District ought to continue appropriations for these other smaller markets in various parts of the city? Is it the idea of the Senator and of the Committee on Appropriations that that should be done?

Mr. PHIPPS. It is. I think if the Senator had been with the committee when we visited the Western Market he would have been convinced that it is necessary to maintain the market. It is well patronized. It is attractive in appearance. It is well kept, and the only thing about it at the present time is that the buildings are so old that the roof has failed, and the old refrigerators, which are really nothing but wooden ice boxes, should be replaced with modern appliances.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment of the Committee on Appropriations was, under the subhead "Office of the director of traffic," on page 9, line 12, after the figures "1923," to strike out "\$25,940" and insert "\$31,280," so as to read:

For personal services, in accordance with the classification act of 1923, \$31,280.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Recorder of deeds," on page 11, line 13, after the figures "1923," to strike out "\$92,500" and insert "\$96,000," so as to read:

For personal services, in accordance with the classification act of 1923, \$96,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 11, line 19, after the word "postage," to insert "rest room for sick and injured em-

ployees and the equipment of and medical supplies of said rest room"; and in line 21, after the word "expenses," to strike out "\$14,500" and insert "\$15,000," so as to make the paragraph read:

For miscellaneous and contingent expenses, including telephone service, printing, binding, rebinding, repairing, and preservation of records; typewriters, towels, towel service, furniture and equipment and repairs thereto; books of reference, law books and periodicals, street-car tokens, postage, rest room for sick and injured employees and the equipment of and medical supplies for said rest room, and all other necessary incidental expenses, \$15,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Gasoline tax, road and street fund," on page 19, after line 8, to insert:

Northwest: Sixteenth Street, Alaska Avenue to the District line, \$132,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 19, after line 22, to strike out:

Northwest: Garfield Street, Wisconsin Avenue to Bellevue Terrace, \$9,500.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, at the top of page 20, to strike out:

Northwest: Bellevue Terrace, Fulton Street to Cathedral Avenue, \$13,100.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 20, after line 2, to insert:

Northwest: Reno Road, Quebec Street to Rodman Street, \$4,800.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 21, after line 20, to strike out:

Northwest: Allison Street, New Hampshire Avenue to Illinois Avenue, \$7,500.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 21, after line 22, to strike out:

Northwest: Thirty-eighth Street, S Street to T Street, \$5,100.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, at the top of page 22, to strike out:

Northwest: Forty-second Street, Jenifer Street to Military Road, \$8,600.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 26, after line 9, to strike out:

Southeast: B Street, Fifteenth Street to Eighteenth Street, \$16,300.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 27, after line 22, to insert:

Northwest: Hurst Terrace, Fulton Street northward, \$8,400.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 28, after line 6, to strike out:

Northeast: New York Avenue, Florida Avenue to West Virginia Avenue, \$36,900.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 28, after line 17, to strike out "Northwest: For widening and repaving the roadway of Connecticut Avenue by 7 feet on the west side from M Street to Eighteenth Street, adjacent to United States reservation No. 150; by 3 feet on the east side from Eighteenth Street to N Street, adjacent to United States reservation No. 150A; by 15 feet on the west side from Eighteenth Street to N Street; and by 15 feet on each side from N Street to Dupont Circle, \$60,000," and in lieu thereof to insert:

Northwest: For widening and repaving the roadway of Connecticut Avenue by 7 feet on the west side from M Street to Eighteenth Street, adjacent to United States reservation No. 150; by 15 feet on the east side from Eighteenth Street to N Street, adjacent to United States reservation No. 150A, including the necessary adjustment in line and grade of the statue occupying this reservation; by 15 feet on the west side from Eighteenth Street to N Street; and by 15 feet on each side from N Street to Dupont Circle, \$65,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 30, after line 7, to insert:

Northwest: For widening to 50 feet and repaving the roadway of H Street from Seventeenth Street to Pennsylvania Avenue, \$30,000, and those portions of Public Act No. 688, Sixty-ninth Congress, making appropriations for the government of the District of Columbia for the fiscal year 1928, approved March 2, 1927, which appropriated \$10,000 for widening and repaving this street from Seventeenth Street to Eighteenth Street, together with the provisions therein in respect to the assessments of the cost of said work are hereby repealed.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, in view of the amendment on page 29 for widening and repaving the roadway of Connecticut Avenue, and so forth, I would be glad to have the Senator in charge of the bill state what his understanding is that the future program is to be with respect to the widening of streets and the uprooting of trees which have added so much to the beauty of the city.

I suppose I have received a hundred letters within the past three weeks and I have had visits from a large number of residents of the city protesting against what they call the vandalism of the destruction of the trees along the city streets and the widening of those streets. They claim that the beauty of the city is being greatly marred and that it looks as though an attempt were being made to make Washington a commercial city rather than a capital. Many such criticisms come from residents of Washington as well as from those who visit the Capital City. I should like to ask the chairman of the committee whether it is the plan to widen many more streets; and if so, whether it is the purpose to continue the destruction of the trees upon some of the choicest avenues and streets of the city?

Mr. PHIPPS. Mr. President, the particular item providing for an expenditure of \$65,000, and another small item in the bill, will practically complete the widening of Connecticut Avenue, which is a main thoroughfare and which has been changed from a residence street to a business street. Fortunately, that avenue was wide enough to admit of narrowing the sidewalks and adding to the main roadway.

The street-widening operations in Washington, I think, are nearing an end. It is my opinion that the widening should not be further encouraged, and that it should only be resorted to in business sections in the case of business streets, where it is necessary to have greater width of roadway in order to accommodate the traffic. Traffic is increasing right along. That condition naturally comes with the increase in population, and I assume with a further increase in the number of automobiles, even without an increase in population, we shall still have more and more of a congested situation, which is largely brought about by the practice that has grown up of parking automobiles along the public highways. Perhaps it would be impossible to find sufficient covered space in the city in all the buildings that could be made available to house the automobiles now in use, but it does seem a pity that the main thoroughfares and the beautiful residential streets of this city should be used as all-day and all-night garages. It detracts from the beauty and the appearance of the city. It is too bad that it has been found necessary to widen some of the streets and sacrifice the old trees that were on them, in order that automobiles might still park along the sidewalk and allow the traffic to move in the center of the street.

I am in accord with the Senator from Utah in feeling that we should restrict the operation of further widening streets and avenues in so far as possible. While I have not had a thorough discussion of the matter recently with the Commissioners of the District or the authorities having the streets and highways in charge, it is my impression that we are about at an end of that kind of activity. I certainly trust that we are.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, I am very glad to receive the assurance of the Senator from Colorado. I know he has given more attention to the condition of the streets, and, indeed, to the general condition of the District of Columbia, than has any Senator on the committee, and his judgment upon these matters I regard as very important.

The reading of the bill was resumed.

The next amendment of the Committee on Appropriations was, on page 31, at the end of line 12, to strike out "\$200,000" and insert "\$290,000," so as to read:

For construction of curbs and gutters, or concrete shoulders in connection with all forms of macadam roadways and adjustment of roadways thereto, together with resurfacing of such roadways where necessary, \$290,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 31, line 14, after the words "In all," to strike out "\$1,675,300" and insert "\$1,848,500," so as to read:

In all, \$1,848,500; to be disbursed and accounted for as "Gasoline tax, road and street improvements," and for that purpose shall constitute one fund and be available immediately.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Street repair, grading, and extension," on page 33, line 3, after the word "resurfacing," to insert "or replacement"; in the same line, after the word "other," to strike out "not inferior" and insert "approved"; and in line 6, after the word "appropriation," to strike out "\$1,475,000, of which \$90,000 shall be paid from the 'gasoline tax, road and street fund'" and insert "\$1,675,000," so as to read:

Repairs: For current work of repairs to streets, avenues, roads, and alleys, including purchase, exchange, maintenance, and operation of nonpassenger-carrying motor vehicles used in this work, and the rental of necessary garage space therefor; and including the surfacing and resurfacing, or replacement with the same or other approved materials, of such asphalt or concrete pavements as may be done within the funds available under this appropriation, \$1,675,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Bridges," on page 35, after line 11, to insert:

For the preparation of plans and specifications for the elimination of the Michigan Avenue grade crossing in the District of Columbia in accordance with the provisions of the act approved March 3, 1927, \$5,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Trees and parkings," on page 35, at the end of line 23, to strike out "\$100,000" and insert "\$125,000," so as to make the paragraph read:

For contingent expenses, including laborers, trimmers, nurserymen, repairmen, teamsters, hire of carts, wagons, or motor trucks, trees, tree boxes, tree stakes, tree straps, tree labels, planting and care of trees on city and suburban streets, care of trees, tree spaces, purchase and maintenance of nonpassenger-carrying motor vehicles, and miscellaneous items, \$125,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Public playgrounds," on page 39, line 6, before the word "and," to strike out "exchange," so as to read:

For general maintenance, improvement, equipment, supplies, incidental and contingent expenses of playgrounds, including labor, purchase and exchange at not exceeding \$675, and maintenance of one motor truck, under the direction and supervision of the commissioners, \$51,500.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Electrical department," on page 40, line 12, to strike out "\$31,050" and insert "\$33,000," so as to make the paragraph read:

For general supplies, repairs, new batteries and battery supplies, telephone rental and purchase, telephone service charges, wire and cable for extension of telegraph and telephone service, repairs of lines and instruments, purchase of poles, tools, insulators, brackets, pins, hardware, cross arms, ice, record books, stationery, printing, livery, purchase and repair of bicycles, blacksmithing, extra labor, new boxes, maintenance of motor trucks, and other necessary items, \$33,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 40, line 25, after the word "spaces," to insert "part cost of maintenance of lights at Bolling Field necessary for operation of the air mail," so as to read:

Lighting: For purchase, installation, and maintenance of public lamps, lamp-posts, street designations, lanterns, and fixtures of all kinds on streets, avenues, roads, alleys, and public spaces, part cost of maintenance of lights at Bolling Field necessary for operation of the air mail, and for all necessary expenses in connection therewith, including rental of stables and storerooms, livery and extra labor, this sum to be expended in accordance with the provisions of sections 7 and 8 of the District of Columbia appropriation act for the fiscal year 1912, and with the provisions of the District of Columbia appropriation act for the fiscal year 1913, and other laws applicable thereto, including not to exceed \$950 for purchase of two light nonpassenger-carrying motor vehicles and including not to exceed \$20,000 for the purchase, installation, and maintenance of electric traffic lights, signals, and controls, \$949,450.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Public schools," on page 42, at the end of line 19, to strike out "\$127,540" and insert "\$134,680," so as to make the paragraph read:

For personal services of clerks and other employees in accordance with the classification act of 1923, \$134,680.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 48, after line 12, to strike out "No part of the appropriations herein made for the public schools of the District of Columbia shall be used for the instruction of pupils who dwell outside the District of Columbia: *Provided*, That this limitation shall not apply to pupils who are enrolled in the schools of the District of Columbia on the date of the approval of this act," and in lieu thereof to insert:

The children of officers and men of the United States Army, Navy, and Marine Corps, and children of other employees of the United States stationed outside the District of Columbia shall be admitted to the public schools without payment of tuition.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 49, line 8, after the word "years," to insert "such work to be performed by day labor or otherwise in the discretion of the Commissioners of the District of Columbia," so as to make the paragraph read:

Not to exceed \$100,000 of the unexpended balances of appropriations for buildings and grounds, public schools, contained in the second deficiency act fiscal year 1925, the District of Columbia appropriation act fiscal year 1926, the first deficiency act fiscal year 1926, and the District of Columbia appropriation act fiscal year 1927, is hereby made available until June 30, 1929, for the improvement of grounds surrounding public-school buildings, constructed under appropriation for the fiscal year 1927 and prior fiscal years, such work to be performed by day labor or otherwise in the discretion of the Commissioners of the District of Columbia.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 52, line 24, after the figures "\$250,000," to insert "to be immediately available," so as to read:

For proper grading, seeding, and sodding; for the construction of roads, walks, and steps; for seating; for running track, baseball diamond, tennis courts, and other athletic facilities; for fencing and other necessary work to fit up for athletic purposes the ground purchased as a joint site for the Langley Junior High School and the McKinley High School, \$250,000, to be immediately available.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading, "Metropolitan police, salaries," on page 56, line 5, to strike out "\$2,694,727.08" and insert "\$2,740,700," so as to read:

For the pay and allowances of officers and members of the Metropolitan police force, in accordance with the act entitled "An act to fix the salaries of the Metropolitan police force, the United States park police force, and the fire department of the District of Columbia," including compensation at the rate of \$1,860 per annum for the present assistant property clerk of the police department, \$2,740,700.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 56, line 7, after the figures "1923," to strike out "\$148,536.92" and insert "\$99,770," so as to read:

For personal services in accordance with the classification act of 1923, \$99,770.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 57, line 19, after the word "police," to strike out "\$64,225" and insert "\$67,075," so as to read:

Uniforms: For furnishing uniforms and other official equipment prescribed by department regulations as necessary and requisite in the performance of duty to officers and members of the Metropolitan police, \$67,075.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "House of detention," on page 58, line 7, after the word "detention," to strike out "of children under 17 years of age and, in the discretion of the commissioners."

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, I ask the Senator from Colorado to allow that amendment to go over until the amendment on page 73 shall be disposed of. I really should like to have it go over until to-morrow if the 40-60 amendment shall go over. I do not want to raise a point of order against the amendment on page 73, but if that amendment is to be acted on to-night, I should be inclined to make a point of order against it.

Mr. PHIPPS. Mr. President, I should have no objection to having both items, that is, the amendment on page 58, line 7, and the amendment on page 73, beginning in line 21, in reference, respectively, to the house of detention and a reception

home, or whatever it may be called, for children, passed over. I ask that those items may go over.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the amendments indicated will be passed over.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, may I ask the Senator in charge of the bill if he intends to insist on a vote on the amendment on page 73? Several Senators have spoken to me about it. I have not as yet received the information I should like to obtain in reference to the item, but there is considerable opposition to it.

Mr. PHIPPS. It is my intention to secure further information on the subject. I had thought that the two items as they now appear in the bill modifying the House language would open the way for the entire question to be taken up and considered in conference. It is rather a long story, I will say to the Senator.

Mr. CURTIS. Then let the amendment be passed over to-night.

Mr. PHIPPS. It may be passed over to-night, and I will be glad to talk it over with the Senator.

Mr. CURTIS. I thank the Senator from Colorado.

Mr. PHIPPS. Some of the information I have asked for, I regret to say, has not as yet reached me, although it was promised by noon to-day.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, may I inquire of the Senator from Kansas if he objects to the disposition of children who may have been arrested in a different manner from that obtaining in the past? The Senator knows that the Board of Public Welfare was created after years of earnest study by persons who were deeply concerned in social welfare and the care of children. A great many have felt, as I have felt, that it is wholly improper to let policemen and policewomen have charge of little children, but that they ought to be cared for in a suitable place.

Mr. CURTIS. I agree with the Senator that they should be cared for in a proper and safe place and not be kept with criminals.

Mr. KING. They should not be kept under police surveillance.

Mr. CURTIS. I happened to be in charge of the bill when the original provision was made for taking care of children who might be arrested and for segregating them from criminals. I am advised that they are not now detained in places where they can come in contact with criminals, but are otherwise taken care of; that if this amendment goes in the bill, the situation will not be relieved, but that by the end of the year perhaps a change can be made that will be beneficial. I have not all the facts; I should like to gather them. I am just as anxious to see children properly taken care of as is the Senator from Utah, and, having proposed the original provision relating to the subject, and having had put in the bill the item to remodel the old building that was used for the purpose of providing for children who might be detained, I was asked to look into this item.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, my position is that while children may be arrested by policemen or policewomen, after their arrest, if they are to be held in custody for any considerable length of time, they ought not to be under the control of policemen or policewomen, but there ought to be a suitable home or place for them.

Mr. CURTIS. Under the charge of a matron.

Mr. KING. Under charge of a suitable matron.

Mr. CURTIS. I agree with the Senator as to that.

Mr. KING. They ought not to be under the influence of policemen or policewomen or be regarded as being under such control. I have favored the establishment of a suitable home or place for children who may have been taken into custody by policemen or by policewomen.

Mr. SACKETT. The Senator understands that the amendment proposed by the committee would do that?

Mr. KING. Exactly; and I am in favor of it.

The reading of the bill was resumed. The next amendment of the Committee on Appropriations was, on page 58, in line 16, after the word "expenses," to strike out "\$14,000" and insert "\$8,000"; and in line 17, after the figures "1923," to strike out "\$15,780; in all, \$29,780," and insert "\$6,480; in all, \$14,480."

Mr. PHIPPS. All the amendments on page 58, from line 6 to line 22, inclusive, relate to the subject which has just been discussed, and should be passed over. The amendment beginning in line 23, however, should be acted upon, because it has to do with quarters for the health department clinics. The item is eliminated at this point in the bill, but is reinserted at another point.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendments referred to by the Senator from Colorado will be passed over.

The reading of the bill was resumed. The next amendment of the Committee on Appropriations was, on page 58, after line 22, to strike out:

For rental, repair, and alteration of quarters for health department clinics, including installation of necessary equipment, \$8,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Fire department, miscellaneous," at the top of page 61, to insert:

The Commissioners of the District of Columbia are authorized to dispose of, by public or private sale in their discretion, the site acquired for an engine house at Sixteenth and Webster Street NW., and the proceeds thereof shall be deposited in the Treasury of the United States to the credit of the District of Columbia, and the said commissioners are authorized to acquire another site in the vicinity of Sixteenth Street and Piney Branch Road NW., and the sum of \$35,000 is hereby appropriated for this purpose: *Provided*, That the commissioners are authorized in their discretion, to locate the said engine house on land now owned by the District of Columbia, in lieu of purchasing another site therefor: *Provided further*, That the unexpended balances of appropriations made in previous acts for house, site, furniture, and furnishing, etc., for a new engine company in the vicinity of Sixteenth Street and Piney Branch Road NW., are hereby continued and made available for expenditure for such purposes during the fiscal year 1929.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Health department, prevention of contagious diseases," on page 63, after line 18, to insert:

For rental, repair, and alteration of quarters for health department clinics, including installation of necessary equipment, \$8,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Courts and prisons, juvenile court," on page 66, line 23, to strike out "\$53,050" and insert "\$56,770," so as to read:

Salaries: For personal services in accordance with the classification act of 1923, \$56,770.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Supreme Court, District of Columbia," on page 69, line 14, after the word "justice," to strike out "\$11,520; in all, \$72,020," and insert "\$14,400; in all, \$74,900," so as to read:

Salaries: Chief justice, \$10,500; five associate justices, at \$10,000 each; six stenographers, one for the chief justice and one for each associate justice, \$14,400; in all, \$74,900.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 70, line 3, after the word "commissioners," to strike out "\$41,660" and insert "\$41,903," so as to read:

Pay of bailiffs: For not exceeding one crier in each court, of office deputy marshals who act as bailiffs or criers, and for expenses of meals and lodging for jurors in United States cases and of bailiffs in attendance upon same when ordered by the court, clerk of jury commissioners, and per diems of jury commissioners, \$41,903.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 70, line 6, after the word "services," to strike out "\$8,720" and insert "\$8,920"; and in line 7, after the words "in all," to strike out "\$9,220" and insert "\$9,420," so as to read:

Probation system: For personal services, \$8,920; contingent expenses, \$500; in all, \$9,420.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 70, at the end of line 10, to strike out "\$29,300" and insert "\$29,704," so as to read:

Courthouse: For personal services for care and protection of the courthouse, under the direction of the United States marshal of the District of Columbia, \$29,704, to be expended under the direction of the Attorney General.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Court of appeals," on page 70, line 20, after the word "service," to strike out "\$23,710" and insert "\$24,190"; and at the beginning of line 22, to strike out "\$62,160" and insert "\$62,640," so as to read:

Salaries: Chief justice and two associate justices, at \$12,500 each; all other officers and employees of the court, including reporting service, \$24,190; necessary expenditures in the conduct of the clerk's office, \$950; in all, \$62,640.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 73, after line 20, to insert:

For the maintenance, under the jurisdiction of the Board of Public Welfare, of a suitable place for the reception and detention of children under 17 years of age arrested by the police on charge of offense against any laws in force in the District of Columbia, or committed to the guardianship of the board, or held as witnesses, or held temporarily, or pending hearing, or otherwise, including transportation, purchase of one passenger-carrying motor vehicle at a cost not to exceed \$750, operation and maintenance of motor vehicles, food, clothing, medicine and medical supplies, rental and repair and upkeep of buildings, fuel, gas, electricity, ice, supplies and equipment, and other necessary expenses, including personal services in accordance with the classification act of 1923, \$25,000, to be immediately available: *Provided*, That such portion as the Commissioners of the District of Columbia may determine of the appropriation of \$25,000 for rent, under the heading "Contingent and miscellaneous expenses, District of Columbia," contained in the first deficiency act, fiscal year 1928, shall be available for the purposes of this paragraph.

Mr. PHIPPS. This is the amendment which it has been agreed shall be passed over.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the amendment will be passed over.

The reading of the bill was resumed.

The next amendment of the Committee on Appropriations was, under the subhead "Reformatory," on page 78, after line 5, to insert:

Working capital: To provide working capital for industrial enterprises at the workhouse and the reformatory, the commissioners shall transfer to a fund, to be known as the working-capital fund, such amounts appropriated herein for the workhouse and reformatory, not to exceed \$50,000 as are available for industrial work at these institutions. The various departments and institutions of the District of Columbia and the Federal Government may purchase, at fair market prices, as determined by the commissioners, such industrial or farm products as meet their requirements. Receipts from the sale of such products shall be deposited to the credit of said working-capital fund, and the said fund, including all receipts credited thereto, may be used as a revolving fund during the fiscal year 1929. This fund shall be available for the purchase and repair of machinery and equipment, for the purchase of raw materials and manufacturing supplies, for personal services in accordance with the classification act of 1923, and for the payment to the inmates or their dependents of such pecuniary earnings as the commissioners may deem proper. The commissioners shall include in their annual report to Congress a detailed report of the receipts and expenditures on account of said working-capital fund.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Medical charities," on page 80, line 7, to increase the appropriation for care and treatment of indigent patients at the Columbia Hospital for Women and Lying-in Asylum from "\$15,300" to "\$17,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 80, line 8, to increase the appropriation for care and treatment of indigent patients at the Children's Hospital from "\$27,000" to "\$30,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 80, line 9, to increase the appropriation for care and treatment of indigent patients at Providence Hospital from "\$15,300" to "\$17,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 80, line 10, to increase the appropriation for care and treatment of indigent patients at Garfield Memorial Hospital from "\$15,300" to "\$17,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 80, line 14, to increase the appropriation for care and treatment of indigent patients at Georgetown University Hospital from "\$7,200" to "\$8,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 80, line 15, to increase the appropriation for care and treatment of indigent patients at the George Washington University Hospital from "\$7,200" to "\$8,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "District Training School," on page 82, after line 22, to strike out "For artesian well, pump, and necessary water lines for farm buildings, \$9,000," and insert:

For artesian wells, pumps, and necessary water lines, \$9,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Industrial Home School," on page 84, line 6, to reduce the appropriation

for maintenance, including care of horses, purchase and care of wagon and harness, from "\$24,600" to "\$21,600."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Home for Aged and Infirm," on page 84, line 20, after the word "commissioners," to strike out "\$12,000" and insert "\$15,000, of which \$3,000 shall be immediately available," so as to read:

For repairs and improvements to buildings and grounds, such work to be performed by day labor or otherwise in the discretion of the commissioners, \$15,000, of which \$3,000 shall be immediately available.

Mr. PHIPPS. Mr. President, this will be tied up with the other amendment, the one on page 84, lines 20 and 21. There is an increase of \$3,000 that will have to be passed over for later consideration.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the amendment will be passed over.

The reading of the bill was resumed.

The next amendment of the Committee on Appropriations was, under the subhead "Temporary home for Union ex-soldiers and sailors (Department of the Potomac, G. A. R.)," on page 85, line 4, after the figures "1923," to strike out "\$3,240" and insert "\$3,360"; and in line 5, after the words "in all," strike out "\$12,740" and insert "\$12,860," so as to read:

For personal services in accordance with the classification act of 1923, \$3,360, maintenance and repairs to building, \$9,500; in all, \$12,860, to be expended under the direction of the commissioners; and Union ex-soldiers, sailors, or marines of the Civil War, ex-soldiers, sailors, or marines of the Spanish War, Philippine insurrection, or China relief expedition, and soldiers, sailors, or marines of the World War or who served prior to July 2, 1921, shall be admitted to the home, all under the supervision of a board of management.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Relief of the poor," on page 87, line 2, before the word "medical," to insert "relief of the poor, including," so as to read:

For relief of the poor, including medical and surgical supplies, artificial limbs, and for pay of physicians to the poor, to be expended under the direction of the Board of Public Welfare, \$8,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Salaries, public parks, District of Columbia," on page 89, line 22, to increase the appropriation for personal services in accordance with the classification act of 1923, from "\$355,460" to "\$368,200."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "General expenses, public parks," on page 90, line 23, after the word "vehicle," to strike out "\$386,975" and insert "\$523,975," so as to read:

General expenses: For general expenses in connection with the maintenance, care, improvement, furnishing of heat, light, and power of public parks, grounds, fountains, and reservations, propagating gardens and greenhouses under the jurisdiction of the Office of Public Buildings and Public Parks of the National Capital, including \$5,000 for the maintenance of the tourists' camp on its present site in East Potomac Park, and including personal services of seasonal or intermittent employees at per diem rates of pay approved by the director, not exceeding current rates of pay for similar employment in the District of Columbia; the hire of draft animals with or without drivers at local rates approved by the director; the purchase and maintenance of draft animals, harness, and wagons; contingent expenses; city directories; communication service; car fare; traveling expenses; professional, scientific, technical, and law books; periodicals and reference books; blank books and forms; photographs; dictionaries and maps; leather and rubber articles for the protection of employees and property; the maintenance, repair, exchange, and operation of not to exceed four motor-propelled passenger-carrying vehicles and all necessary bicycles, motor cycles, and self-propelled machinery; the purchase, maintenance, and repair of equipment and fixtures, etc.; and not to exceed \$475 for the purchase and exchange of a motor-propelled passenger-carrying vehicle, \$523,975.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, I invite the attention of the Senator to that amendment.

Mr. PHIPPS. I shall be glad to explain it.

The large increase here is detailed on the following page. This increase includes \$100,000 for the improvement of the Meridian Hill Park, which was entirely omitted from the estimates, although it had been recommended by the commissioners. It also includes an increase of \$32,000 for the improvement of the Rock Creek and Potomac Parkway, which raises that to the estimate, and \$5,000 for a comfort station at Seventeenth Street and Pennsylvania Avenue.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, with respect to the Meridian Hill Park, I think there has been too much delay in the completion of that splendid part of our city. If we had completed it several years ago, instead of doing the work by piecemeal and by sections, it would have cost less and we would have had the benefit of the park long before this.

Mr. PHIPPS. I regret to say that even at the rate of \$100,000 a year it will take three years more to complete the work.

Mr. KING. In view of that statement, I should favor a larger appropriation to complete it, if that could be used.

Mr. PHIPPS. They could not use more than that. We have given them all that they feel they can use to advantage, because some public-spirited people are going to put about \$100,000 of their own into the park in the way of a monument.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The reading of the bill was resumed.

The next amendment of the Committee on Appropriations was, on page 91, line 5, after the word "exceeding," to strike out "\$93,000" and insert "\$125,000," so as to read:

Provided, That not exceeding \$35,000 of the amount herein appropriated may be expended for placing and maintaining portions of the parks in condition for outdoor sports and for expenses incident to the conducting of band concerts in the parks; not exceeding \$25,000 for the improvement and maintenance as recreation parks of sections C and D, Anacostia Park; not exceeding \$125,000 for the improvement of the Rock Creek and Potomac connecting parkway and the continuation of construction of sea wall.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 91, line 8, after the words "sea wall" and the semicolon, to insert the following item: "not exceeding \$100,000 for the improvement of Meridian Hill Park."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 91, line 9, after the word "exceeding," to strike out "\$5,000" and insert "\$10,000," so as to read:

and not exceeding \$10,000 for the erection of minor auxiliary structures.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 91, line 10, after the word "structures," to insert a comma and the following:

of which amount not to exceed \$5,000 shall be available toward the erection of a public comfort station and shelter on public land at Seventeenth Street and Pennsylvania Avenue SE., subject to contribution being made by a local street railway company in an amount of not less than \$2,500 for expenditure by the Director of Public Buildings and Public Parks to meet part of the cost of this project.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 91, after line 21, to insert:

Not exceeding \$2,000 of the appropriation contained in Public Act No. 688, Sixty-ninth Congress, making appropriation for the government of the District of Columbia for the fiscal year 1928 for general expenses, public parks, is hereby made available for the necessary alteration to the Franklin Park comfort station and storage yard, to permit the widening of Thirteenth Street NW. provided for in the District of Columbia appropriation act for the fiscal year 1928.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "National Capital Park and Planning Commission," on page 93, line 4, after the word "binding," to strike out "\$600,000" and insert "\$1,000,000"; and in line 6, after the word "than," to strike out "\$150,000" and insert "\$400,000," so as to make the paragraph read:

For each and every purpose requisite for and incident to the work of the National Capital Park and Planning Commission as authorized by the act entitled "An act providing for a comprehensive development of the park and playground system of the National Capital," approved June 6, 1924, as amended, including not to exceed \$100 for technical books and periodicals, not to exceed \$40,530 for personal services in the District of Columbia in accordance with the classification act of 1923, and the act approved April 30, 1926 (44 Stat. L. 374), and not to exceed \$3,500 for printing and binding, \$1,000,000, to be immediately available and to remain available until expended: Provided, That not more than \$400,000 of this appropriation shall be available for the purchase of sites without limitation as to price based on assessed value and that the purchase price to be paid for any site out of the remainder of the appropriation shall not exceed

the full value assessment of such property last made before purchase thereof plus 25 per cent of such assessed value.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "National Zoological Park," on page 94, line 4, after the word "periodicals," to strike out "\$180,250" and insert "\$182,050," so as to make the paragraph read:

For roads, walks, bridges, water supply, sewerage, and drainage; grading, planting, and otherwise improving the grounds, erecting and repairing buildings and inclosures; care, subsistence, purchase, and transportation of animals; necessary employees; traveling and incidental expenses not otherwise provided for, including maintenance and operation of one motor-propelled passenger-carrying vehicle required for official purposes; not exceeding \$2,500 for purchasing and supplying uniforms to park police, keepers, and assistant keepers; not exceeding \$100 for the purchase of necessary books and periodicals, \$182,050, no part of which sum shall be available for architect's fees or compensation.

The amendment was agreed to.

The VICE PRESIDENT. That completes the committee amendments, except those passed over.

The reading of the bill was concluded.

COL. CARL L. ESTES—OUACHITA NATIONAL PARK

Mr. MAYFIELD. I ask unanimous consent to have published in the RECORD a telegram from Col. Carl L. Estes to the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. CARAWAY].

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered. The telegram is as follows:

TYLER, TEX., April 2, 1928.

UNITED STATES SENATOR T. H. CARAWAY (ARKANSAS),

United States Senate, Washington, D. C.:

The presidents of the three Tyler banks and following ministers of the gospel in my home town sign this statement to-day: "We the undersigned ministers of the gospel in Tyler, Tex., unhesitatingly state that Col. Carl Estes, newspaper man of this city, is a truthful, upright citizen and that you may depend upon what he says as being the absolute truth": Rev. C. M. Baby Marvin, Methodist Church; Rev. James Ulmer, First Christian Church; Rev. Robert Hill, First Presbyterian Church; Rev. J. T. McNew, First Baptist Church; Rev. W. N. Claybrook, Episcopal Church; Rev. Floyd Aten Bostick, Baptist Church; Rev. M. Faber, rabbi Temple Bethel; (Joseph M. Haddad, grand knight of the Knights of Columbus, signed this statement in the absence of Father Sampari, rector of the Catholic church) Gus F. Taylor, president Citizens' National Bank; Sam R. Greer, president Peoples' National Bank; C. J. Brogan, president Tyler State Bank & Trust Co., signed statements vouching for my truth and veracity. Please have this read into the RECORD, as the Associated Press in the Southwest leaves me branded as a liar. Please show to Senator MAYFIELD. Original statements with signatures mailed to you to-night. Man named Clark Greer was not in Secretary Work's office during the interview, as stated in press dispatches to-day. Remember, I stand ready to return at any moment. By all means hold on to that copy I gave you of the letter which Capt. J. F. Lucey, Hoover's campaign leader in Texas, wrote to Lawrence Richey, one of Mr. Hoover's aides there in Washington. We are going to need that thing very badly, unless I miss my guess.

COL. CARL L. ESTES.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. CURTIS. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business. After two minutes spent in executive session the doors were reopened.

DEATH OF REPRESENTATIVE JAMES A. GALLIVAN

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Chaffee, one of its clerks, communicated to the Senate the intelligence of the death of Hon. JAMES A. GALLIVAN, late a Representative from the State of Massachusetts, and transmitted the resolutions of the House thereon.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair lays before the Senate resolutions from the House of Representatives, which will be read.

The resolutions (H. Res. 157) were read, as follows:

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,

April 3, 1928.

Resolved, That the House has heard with profound sorrow of the death of Hon. JAMES A. GALLIVAN, a Representative from the State of Massachusetts.

Resolved, That a committee of 22 Members of the House, with such Members of the Senate as may be joined, be appointed to attend the funeral.

Resolved, That the Sergeant at Arms of the House be authorized and directed to take such steps as may be necessary for carrying out the provisions of these resolutions, and that the necessary expenses in connection therewith be paid out of the contingent fund of the House.

Resolved, That the Clerk communicate these resolutions to the Senate and transmit a copy hereof to the family of the deceased.

Resolved, That as a further mark of respect this House do now adjourn.

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. Mr. President, I submit a resolution and ask unanimous consent for its immediate consideration.

The resolution (S. Res. 187) was read, considered by unanimous consent, and unanimously agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That the Senate has heard with profound sorrow the announcement of the death of Hon. JAMES A. GALLIVAN, late a Representative from the State of Massachusetts.

Resolved, That a committee of six Senators be appointed by the Vice President to join the committee appointed on the part of the House of Representatives to attend the funeral of the deceased Representative.

Resolved, That the Secretary communicate these resolutions to the House of Representatives and transmit a copy thereof to the family of the deceased.

Under the second resolution the Vice President appointed as the committee on the part of the Senate the senior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. GILLET], the junior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. WALSH], the junior Senator from Vermont [Mr. DALE], the senior Senator from Mississippi [Mr. HARRISON], the junior Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS], and the junior Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY].

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. Mr. President, as a further mark of respect to the memory of the deceased Representative, I move that the Senate do now adjourn.

The motion was unanimously agreed to; and (at 3 o'clock and 40 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned until to-morrow, Wednesday, April 4, 1928, at 12 o'clock meridian.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate April 3 (legislative day of April 2), 1928

POSTMASTERS

CALIFORNIA

Jesse D. Myers, Arlington.
Nettie Fausel, Independence.
Belle B. Jenks, Willowbrook.

COLORADO

Frances Lessley, Granby.

IOWA

Eugene Owen, Allison.
George W. Goss, Blainstown.
James T. Bevan, Cascade.
Icea B. Wilcox, Dumont.
Chester A. Baker, Farley.
Roscoe I. Short, Hazleton.
George R. Hughes, Shellrock.
Wynema Bower, State Center.
Thompson C. Moffit, Tipton.

MAINE

Phoebe Stevens, Portage.

NEW MEXICO

Aurelia M. Gutierrez, Old Albuquerque.

NORTH CAROLINA

Walter W. Redman, Pilot Mountain.

NORTH DAKOTA

Edith M. Ericson, Underwood.

VIRGINIA

A. Ewing McMichael, Nokesville.

WYOMING

Richard M. Turner, Frontier.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

TUESDAY, April 3, 1928

The House met at 12 o'clock noon and was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore, Mr. TILSON.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, who wert and art and evermore shall be, bless us with all fullness of grace, might, and redemption. We are weak and full of doubts. Do Thou defend, guard, and be between them and our need. Never allow our steadfastness and confidence to abate. Overcome our fears, our tendencies, and our compromises, lest we be judged unfaithful to our sacred vows. Let no harsh or unwise word mar the good we might do here. In spite of old sins, old failures, and old sorrows, may all of us take new heart with this new day and begin again. We breathe our prayer of praise and gratitude to the God of our fathers.

We wonder what day of the week, we wonder what night of the year when the messenger shall call. He has come and one has answered the summons. He has fallen in the strength of his years. O God, we beseech Thee to bestow the blessings of peace and consolation upon all the sorrowing ones. So teach us to number the days that we may apply our hearts unto wisdom. Through Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Craven, its principal clerk, announced that the Senate had passed with amendments bills of the following titles, in which the concurrence of the House of Representatives was requested:

H. R. 359. An act authorizing the presentation of the iron gates in West Executive Avenue, between the grounds of the State, War, and Navy Building and the White House, to the Ohio State Archeological and Historical Society for the memorial gateways into the Spiegel Grove State Park; and

H. R. 5721. An act authorizing E. M. Elliott & Associates (Inc.), its successors and assigns, to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge across the Ohio River at Augusta, Ky.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed without amendment bills of the following titles:

H. R. 4115. An act for the relief of Winfield Scott;

H. R. 4116. An act for the relief of W. Laurence Hazard; and

H. R. 4117. An act for the relief of Harriet K. Carey.

The message further announced that the Senate had passed a joint resolution, a concurrent resolution, and bills of the following titles, in which the concurrence of the House of Representatives was requested:

S. J. Res. 97. Joint resolution authorizing the President to appoint three delegates to the Twenty-third International Congress of Americanists, and making an appropriation for the expenses of such congress;

S. Con. Res. 13. Concurrent resolution to pay the necessary expenses of the joint committee appointed to represent Congress at the unveiling of the Stone Mountain Monument at Atlanta, Ga., on April 9, 1928;

S. 805. An act donating Revolutionary cannon to the New York State conservation department;

S. 2542. An act for the construction of a private conduit across Lincoln Road NE., in the District of Columbia; and

S. 3791. An act to aid the Grand Army of the Republic in its Memorial Day services, May 30, 1928.

FILING OF CERTAIN REPORTS AND MINORITY VIEWS

Mr. COLE of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I am under instructions from the Committee on Foreign Affairs to report out House Joint Resolution 259 this afternoon. I ask unanimous consent to be permitted to file the report up to midnight to-day.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Iowa asks unanimous consent to have until midnight to-day within which to file a report upon House Joint Resolution 259, from the Committee on Foreign Affairs. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. MORTON D. HULL. Mr. Speaker, I make a similar request with reference to filing the report upon House Joint Resolution 262.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. CLARKE. Mr. Speaker, it is my understanding that the majority report upon the Haugen bill—H. R. 7940—was to be

filed yesterday or will be filed to-day. I expect to be absent for a few days, and I ask unanimous consent to have five legislative days after the filing of the majority report in which to file my own personal minority views.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the gentleman from New York?

Mr. GARNER of Texas. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, may I ask the gentleman from New York [Mr. SNELL] whether it is the purpose not to consider this legislation within the next five legislative days?

Mr. SNELL. Mr. Speaker, as a matter of fact, we do not know just when it will be considered, because the report has not yet been filed.

Mr. GARNER of Texas. And the gentleman would not want to grant five legislative days within which to file minority views if he were going to call up the legislation before that time? That is the reason I am asking now whether the gentleman expects to call it up within five legislative days.

Mr. SNELL. No arrangement has been made as yet, because the bill has not been reported. I do not know what they want to do. We expect to take the legislation up within a reasonable time.

Mr. GARNER of Texas. Then the gentleman would not let this unanimous request, if it be granted, stand in the way of considering the legislation if he saw proper to do so.

Mr. SNELL. I do not think it would be possible to take it up within five days, anyway.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. ASWELL] spoke to me yesterday about this measure and the filing of minority views upon it. I do not see him in the Chamber at the moment, but while this consent is being granted I think it might be well to prefer a request that if he so desires he may have five legislative days within which to file minority views, including others who wish to join with him.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Tennessee asks unanimous consent that if the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. ASWELL] so desires, he and others who may wish to join with him may have five legislative days within which to file minority views. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. SNELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the special orders in order to-day, and other business that would have been in order to-day, be in order on Thursday next. I make that request because of an announcement which will shortly be made.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from New York asks unanimous consent that the special orders and other business in order to-day may go over until Thursday next and be in order at that time. Is there objection?

Mr. CRAMTON. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, does that carry over Calendar Wednesday business?

Mr. SNELL. It has nothing to do with Calendar Wednesday business. That will come up to-morrow regularly.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I ask the gentleman whether or not the rule on the Newton bill provides under those circumstances that debate will continue on to Friday?

Mr. SNELL. It will be a continuing debate, of course.

DEATH OF REPRESENTATIVE JAMES A. GALLIVAN, OF MASSACHUSETTS

Mr. TREADWAY. Mr. Speaker, I send to the desk a resolution and ask for its immediate consideration.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Massachusetts submits a resolution, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

House Resolution 157

Resolved, That the House has heard with profound sorrow of the death of Hon. JAMES A. GALLIVAN, a Representative of the State of Massachusetts.

Resolved, That a committee of 22 Members of the House, with such Members of the Senate as may be joined, be appointed to attend the funeral.

Resolved, That the Sergeant at Arms of the House be authorized and directed to take such steps as may be necessary for carrying out the provisions of this resolution, and that the necessary expenses connected therewith be paid out of the contingent fund of the House.

Resolved, That the Clerk communicate these resolutions to the Senate and transmit a copy thereof to the family of the deceased.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The committee to attend the funeral will be selected and announced by the Speaker to-morrow.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That as a further mark of respect, this House do now adjourn.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

The resolution was unanimously agreed to.

ADJOURNMENT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The House stands adjourned until to-morrow at 12 o'clock.

Thereupon (at 12 o'clock and 18 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until to-morrow, Wednesday, April 4, 1928, at 12 o'clock noon.

COMMITTEE HEARINGS

Mr. TILSON submitted the following tentative list of committee hearings scheduled for Wednesday, April 4, 1928, as reported to the floor leader by clerks of the several committees:

THE COMMITTEE ON THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA—SUBCOMMITTEE ON PARKS AND PLAYGROUNDS

(7 p. m., room 277)

To consider the bills on the committee calendar.

COMMITTEE ON EXPENDITURES IN THE EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENTS
(10.30 a. m.)

To provide for the transfer to the Department of the Interior of the public-works functions of the Federal Government (H. R. 8127).

COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE
(10 a. m.)

To amend the act entitled "An act to create the Inland Waterways Corporation for the purpose of carrying out the mandate and purpose of Congress, as expressed in sections 201 and 500 of the transportation act," approved June 3, 1924 (H. R. 10710).

COMMITTEE ON NAVAL AFFAIRS
(10.30 a. m.)

To authorize the Secretary of the Navy to lease the United States naval destroyer and submarine base, Squantum, Mass. (H. R. 11922).

COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC BUILDINGS AND GROUNDS
(10.30 a. m.)

Authorizing the paving of the Federal strip known as International Street, adjacent to Nogales, Ariz. (S. 2004).

Authorizing custodians and acting custodians of Federal buildings to administer oaths of office to employees in the custodian service (H. R. 12408).

COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE
(10 a. m.)

To provide for the eradication of pink bollworm and authorizing an appropriation therefor (H. J. Res. 237).

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY
(10 a. m.)

To prohibit the sending and receipt of stolen property through interstate and foreign commerce (H. R. 10287).

COMMITTEE ON MILITARY AFFAIRS
(10 a. m.)

To amend section 127a, national defense act, as amended and approved June 4, 1920 (H. R. 11273).

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

425. Under clause 2 of Rule XXIV, a letter from the Acting Secretary of Commerce, transmitting draft of a bill for the relief of A. Ogden Pierrot, a special temporary disbursing agent of the Department of Commerce, was taken from the Speaker's table and referred to the Committee on Claims.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII,

Mr. PORTER: Committee on Foreign Affairs. H. R. 12178. A bill to repeal Revised Statutes 1683 and part of title 22, section 32, of the United States Code; without amendment

(Rept. No. 1122). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. MORTON D. HULL: Committee on Foreign Affairs. H. J. Res. 262. A joint resolution requesting the President to extend to the Republics of America an invitation to attend a Conference of Conciliation and Arbitration to be held at Washington during 1928 or 1929; without amendment (Rept. No. 1123). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. COLE of Iowa: Committee on Foreign Affairs. H. J. Res. 259. A joint resolution authorizing assistance in the construction of an inter-American highway on the Western Hemisphere; without amendment (Rept. 1124). Referred to the House Calendar.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII,

Mr. HUDSPETH: Committee on Claims. H. R. 2474. A bill for the relief of the San Francisco, Napa & Calistoga Railway; with amendment (Rept. No. 1120). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. BOYLAN: Committee on Military Affairs. H. R. 11429. A bill granting six months' pay to Marjory Virginia Watson; without amendment (Rept. No. 1121). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of Rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. HOWARD of Oklahoma: A bill (H. R. 12660) authorizing an appropriation to reimburse the State of Oklahoma for moneys paid by it for the education of restricted Indian children in the public schools of said State; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota: A bill (H. R. 12661) authorizing the President of the United States to present in the name of Congress a Congressional Medal of Honor to Capt. Edward V. Rickenbacker; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. TARVER: A bill (H. R. 12662) to provide for the paving of the Government road, known as the Dry Valley Road, commencing where said road leaves the La Fayette Road, in the city of Rossville, Ga., and extending to Chickamauga and Chattanooga National Military Park, constituting an approach road to said park; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. WILLIAMSON: A bill (H. R. 12663) to create a commission to investigate the issuance of fee-simple patents to Indians not applying therefor, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. TAYLOR of Tennessee: A bill (H. R. 12664) granting the consent of Congress to the county court of Roane County, Tenn., to construct a bridge across the Emory River at Sudaths Ferry, in Roane County, Tenn.; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BOWMAN: A bill (H. R. 12665) granting a pension to Simon E. Riggleman; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. GAMBRILL: A bill (H. R. 12666) for the relief of William S. Shacklette; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 12667) for the relief of John W. Disney and Bertha A. B. Disney; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. MERRITT: A bill (H. R. 12668) for the relief of the State of Connecticut; to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. TAYLOR of Tennessee: A bill (H. R. 12669) granting an increase of pension to Samuel Inklebarger; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 12670) granting a pension to Ebb Hundley; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 12671) granting a pension to John L. Lawson; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 12672) granting a pension to Peter L. Turpin; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. WARE: A bill (H. R. 12673) granting a pension to Lorena Bartle; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. WINTER: Resolution (H. Res. 156) to pay George Hand, jr., son of George R. Hand, late clerk to Hon. CHARLES E. WINTER, a sum equal to six months' salary and \$250 for funeral expenses; to the Committee on Accounts.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

6353. By Mr. AYRES: Petitions of citizens of El Dorado, Kans., in behalf of pension legislation favorable to Civil War veterans and widows; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

6354. By Mr. BROWNING: Petition from voters of Benton County, Tenn., urging that immediate steps be taken for the relief of Civil War widows and veterans; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

6355. By Mr. BOYLAN: Resolution adopted by New York State Federation of Women's Clubs, at the midwinter board meeting, favoring the passage of the Hawes-Cooper bill; to the Committee on Labor.

6356. By Mr. DRIVER: Petition signed by citizens of Clay County, Ark., urging the Congress to pass legislation for the relief of the Civil War veterans, their widows, and dependents; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

6357. By Mr. HARDY: Petition by Dr. M. L. Rice, president Colorado Conference Seventh Day Adventists, containing 409 signatures, protesting passage of the Lankford Sunday observance bill; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

6358. By Mr. O'BRIEN: Petition of the citizens of Clarksburg, W. Va., urging that immediate steps be taken to bring to a vote a Civil War pension bill carrying the rates proposed by

the National Tribune for the relief of Civil War veterans and their widows; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

6359. Also, petition of the citizens of Buckhannon, W. Va., urging that immediate steps be taken to bring to a vote a Civil War pension bill carrying the rates proposed by the National Tribune for the relief of Civil War veterans and their widows; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

6360. By Mr. O'CONNELL: Petition of the New York State Federation of Women's Clubs, favoring the passage of the Cooper-Hawes bill; to the Committee on Labor.

6361. By Mr. MORROW: Petition of American Legion, Roswell, N. Mex., by William McCullough, State vice chairman, indorsing Tyson-Fitzgerald bill for retirement of disabled emergency officers of World War; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

6362. By Mr. ROWBOTTOM: Petition of C. M. Partridge and practically every citizen in Rockport, Ind., that the bill increasing Civil War widows' pensions be enacted into a law at this session of Congress; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

6363. Also, petition of Theresa Elsassen and others, of Vanderburgh County, Ind., that the bill increasing Civil War widows' pensions be enacted into law at this session of Congress; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

6364. By Mr. VINCENT of Michigan: Petition of sundry citizens of Saginaw County, Mich., in opposition to pending Sunday legislation; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.